

A U M

Unveil, O Thou who givest sustenance to the world, that face of the true Sun, which is now hidden by a vase of golden light ! so that we may see the truth and know our whole duty.

THE ARYAN PATH

VOL. I.

NOVEMBER, 1930.

No. 11

The Editors hold themselves responsible for unsigned articles only. They are not necessarily in agreement with the views of their contributors to whom they leave free expression of opinion.

THE TATHAGATA LIGHT.

" Like the light in the sombre valley seen by the mountaineer from his peaks, every bright thought in your mind, my Brother, will sparkle and attract the attention of your distant friend and correspondent. . . . It is our law to approach every such an one if even there be but the feeblest glimmer of the true ' Tathagata ' light within him."

| MAHATAMA K. H.

It is peculiar to the Tathagata light that it is ever passed from torch to waiting torch. It must be kindled first by contact with the fire in other hearts, through the words, written or spoken, the example, or the briefest touch of the lives of those in whom it burns. Be those who bear the flame Mahatmas Themselves or the humblest of Their followers, however small the gleam or great the light, it has this property of kindling waiting hearts.

Fire does not go in quest of what will burn. Under Nature's law, that in which fire is latent bursts into blaze at contact with the flame. He on the altar of whose heart the Fire of Spirit burns may not blazon forth his deeds ; he may dwell in secrecy and silence ; but it is a fact that he forms a link between the stir of the market-place and the stillness of the snow-capped Himalayas. He may not choose which men shall light their sacrificial flames from his. Those who have made the altar ready within their hearts will catch fire from contact with him, however casual, to all appearances, that contact be.

Though it burns in many hearts it is but One Flame. Those in whom it shines, albeit faintly, bear the proof of closer kinship with the great Masters than the world at large. They have said that the kindling of the light in any heart cannot escape Them. Those who show the gleam become Their special care, not for their own sake, but as potential servants of the race and sharers in Their labours for the common good.

The task of him who awaits the kindling flame is to prepare an altar in his heart and sacrifice thereon his selfish aims and passions, sparing none, lust nor greed nor wrath. Their task also to lay with care the fuel—knowledge of the Teachings, gratitude to Those who place that knowledge within the reach of men, concern for all who tread their hopeless way in darkness. It is the law that when the task is done in appreciable measure, and all made ready for the quickening flame, no man shall wait in vain.

Few men can say what hour the altar fire burst into blaze within ; by its effects its presence may be known. He in whom it is alight finds his mind-understanding of the Teaching gradually enlightened ; his gratitude to Those who guard the Truth down the ages flowers in devotion to Their purposes ; his interest in human weal becomes at last a vast and all embracing love, compassion for the pitiable state of mankind, the Great Orphan, which leaves him no rest but in service.

Not without effort is the prize ours. The fire if left untended, may, nay must, go out. The murky gloom of materialism will not suffer the Tathagata light to pierce through. As a candle in the wind that Light flickers in the gusts of emotion. It is quenched by self-seeking like a torch dipped in water. The heart-light must be tended, its flame fed by sacrifice renewed from day to day, and the lower nature purified, until the light within shines forth, as through pellucid air, lighting the way for all, and kindling ready hearts to fervent flame.

THE NEW RELIGION IN RUSSIA.

[C. E. M. Joad writes out of personal experience. To the Theosophists his article will not come as a surprise.

The religious decay of the churches has been going on for decades, but religious feeling must find channels of expression, and under certain peculiar circumstances it is manifesting freely in the State in Russia. A very similar phenomenon is visible in India. Indian Nationalism has certainly become the channel of religious fervour.

The interesting question is—how long and to what extent such expressions of *feeling* will prevent the mind from seeking answer to the problem of the Hidden Spirit. Materialistic views are being used by the Russian Government to impress the mind of the people, just as in earlier centuries more than one state used, and even now indirectly uses, religious views to influence their citizens. Russia must perforce prevent the spread of the growing knowledge of the borderland sciences lest some physical and biological bubbles are pricked and the human mind is intuitively led on to the power and potency of the Spirit. No—not any state, socialistic or capitalistic, will serve as a substitute for that peculiar but persistent yearning of the human heart to know the meaning and purpose of Life, in which the state is but a speck. One religion may be substituted by another religion, but there is no power in Moscow or anywhere else on earth which can invent a substitute for the Wisdom-Religion. The article of Mr. Geoffrey West which follows, and the Note appended to it, supplement Mr. Joad's masterly survey.—Eds.]

So much political capital has been made out of the alleged persecution of religion in Russia, that it is difficult both to estimate its extent and to gauge its significance. Nor does a short visit to Russia throw much light upon the question. No restrictions, it is true, are placed upon the movements of the foreign visitor; he may see what he pleases. But, unless he can speak Russian, this liberty to view does not take him far, since unable either to talk or to listen, his ignorance of the language precludes him from understanding much of what he sees. Moreover his contacts are made through the medium of guides and interpreters, who are without exception spokesmen of the official point of view.

Having taken care to qualify what I have to say by emphasising the partial and possibly tainted character of the observations upon which it rests, I propose to give as briefly as I can a summary of the facts with regard to the religious situation in Russia. I do this not so much because the facts are in themselves particularly striking—in comparison with the sensational accounts that have appeared they are, indeed, singularly pedestrian—as because their significance, the moral which, to use an old fashioned expression, can be drawn from them, seems to me of the first importance for a reading of contemporary tendencies in the Western world.

Stated shortly the thesis I wish to elaborate is this:—the modern Russian has no religion in the ordinary sense of the word, but he has religious substitutes which appear completely to satisfy his spiritual

aspirations ; the modern Westerner has neither religion nor religious substitutes. The question, therefore, arises, to what extent he may be expected to seek them where the Russians have found them ?

I. THE FACTS.

According to official figures the total number of Churches in Russia at the time of the Revolution was about 50,000. Of these some 3,000 have been closed ; 47,000 are stated to be still open and functioning as religious centres.

It is asserted by the Government that no Church is closed except by the express request of the workers living in the neighbourhood, who wish to use the building as a workman's club, a theatre, or for sleeping accommodation ; the housing shortage is acute in Russia, and every available cubic foot of space is eagerly sought after. I entered a number of churches in Moscow and Leningrad ; the ceremonial was shorn of much of what must, I imagine, have been its pristine elaboration and grandeur, and the numbers of the officiating priests seemed attenuated. However, services were proceeding, and, so far as I could see, without any hint of interruption. Surprisingly they were attended by numbers of children.

What has been suppressed is not religious worship but extra-religious activities conducted by religious bodies. Such suppression operates more particularly against Baptist organisations which have increased considerably in numbers in the last decade. (There are said to be some six million Baptists in Russia at the moment, compared with under a million at the time of the revolution.) The Baptists have been active proselytizers, organising in connection with their places of worship clubs, schools, lectures, workers' benefit and welfare schemes, and social activities of the games and dancing variety. These activities, it is obvious, constituted an encroachment upon Government preserves. The Bolsheviks have staked out a strong propagandist and educational claim upon the ear of the people, a claim which, so far as education is concerned, they have more than made good, and naturally enough will have no squatting on such valuable property. These extra-religious activities of the Baptists which constitute what in England we are accustomed to regard as the mothers' meeting and tea fight aspect of religion, have, therefore, during the last twelve months been rigorously suppressed, and the activities of religious bodies have been confined to what is after all their main function, the organisation and carrying out of religious worship. Provided they do this and no more, they are not interfered with, although they may find serious difficulty in obtaining the necessary buildings.

Also they must pay for their priests, and these, I am afraid, have a very thin time of it indeed. This is not so much because the payment they receive is stinted, although, I imagine, their remuneration is far from princely, as because not being classed as workers they receive no ration cards enabling them to buy necessities at fixed prices. The cost of living in Russia is, except for workers, fantastically

high; soap, for example, when I was in Moscow this summer, was six shillings a cake, while the cost of such necessities as meat, sugar, butter and milk is practically prohibitive except to those whose ration cards entitle them to buy at a controlled price. Hence living for non-workers who receive no ration cards is desperately hard.

The aspect of the priests is gaunt and meagre, as far removed as possible from the pink and rotundly cherubic appearance which characterises English ecclesiastics. But, and this is the important point, except they engage in counter-revolutionary activities they are let alone. The exception, if the Communists are to be believed, is a large one, the priests especially in the villages having made common cause with the Kulahs or rich peasants, in opposing Government schemes for the collectivisation of agriculture. This opposition has led to the death of some and the imprisonment of many, and is no doubt at the bottom of many of the stories of persecution.

On the other hand there is definite anti-religious propaganda in the schools and universities. This propaganda takes the form of critical examinations of Bible stories, combined with an intensive course in biology; proofs of the non-existence of God reinforced with an account of the reasons which have led mankind, and especially bourgeois mankind, to invent and maintain Him, and an historical survey of the past of religions, with special reference to the strife and slaughter for which they have been responsible, and the use to which they have been put by capitalist governments for the purpose of keeping the workers in their places. Religion, in fact, is exhibited as the opium of the people. As part of his educational training the young Russian will also be taken to one of the anti-religious museums which are now to be found in most of the large towns. Here he will see instruments of torture used by the Inquisition, wax-work models of priests working miracles as, for example, by pouring molten red sealing wax through a hole in the back of a saint to produce liquefying stigmata, and photographs of mutilations and sexual perversions practised by members of religious sects. There will also be a first rate collection of biological exhibits showing the gradual evolution of our race from the amœba to man. Solicited from childhood onwards by skilful and unremitting propaganda, the young town Russian by the time he reaches maturity is normally hostile to religion. He regards it as a pack of lies sedulously exploited by ruling classes for propagandist purposes, and as a class-conscious citizen trained in the unsentimental school of materialist philosophy, he contemptuously rejects it.

II. THE SUBSTITUTES.

Nevertheless he has, it is obvious that he must have, substitutes. Asked what they were, he would probably answer that his whole life was a religious substitute, by which he would mean that he found in work and service for the Socialist State a satisfaction of the spirit as real as and more permanent than the illusory consolations of religion. The answer is creditable but vague. Let me try to give it definiteness. The diffused enthusiasm, an enthusiasm amounting almost to veneration

which the Russian worker feels for the Communist State, finds at the moment concrete and visible expression along three channels.

First there is work. As our ship sailed up the estuary of the Neva to Leningrad, we passed a small and crowded passenger steamer. Never have I seen so many people on a boat; they hung from the funnels, precariously perched on masts and rigging, were poised on the bulwarks. We asked where they were going, suspecting some place of merry-making, a sort of Long Island or Hampstead Heath lower down the river. No, we were told, these people were not on amusement bent. A boat had just come into dock and required urgent unloading; there was a temporary shortage of dockers and stevedores, and a call had accordingly gone forth through the factories of Leningrad for volunteers to unload the ship. The people we saw had answered it; they had just come from an eight hour shift in the factories; they would work without payment all night, and they would return to do an eight hour shift again next day.

The incident was symbolic; it symbolises the immense enthusiasm for work which pervades contemporary Russia. Young people spend their holidays not in amusement but in improvement; they learn or teach foreign languages, instruct peasants in scientific farming, or spend their leisure in repairing and making roads. There is a phrase current in Russia meaning "without frills"; religion in the ordinary sense is a "frill," love making is a "frill," drinking a "frill" and novel reading a "frill." People with serious work on hand have no time for such things. Discarding them, young Russians bend all their energies to the service of the State.

Secondly there is machinery. The famous Five Year Plan may be best described as a deliberate attempt to turn Russia into a first class industrial country in five years. New industries spring up like mushrooms, and existing ones are mechanised. The necessary machines have at present to be imported, and each new mechanical arrival is greeted by the Russians as a symbol of the coming millenium. Russians simply cannot take their machines for granted. Like children delighted with a new toy, they show them to you on the cinemas (the typical "News of the Week" film at a Russian cinema records the installation of a new machine, shows it triumphantly working, and ends up with figures indicating the increase of output in which it has resulted), drag you from one end of Russia to another to exhibit their immense new factories and workshops—imagine an Englishman insisting on taking a foreign visitor to Middlesborough or Rotherham to show him blast furnaces!—and half starve themselves in order to pay for them. There is considerable material shortage even privations in Russia to-day, but it is to a large extent voluntary; the Russians export the best of what they produce, and live on the leavings.

Of the godhead machinery, the tractor is the most visible as it is the most loved aspect. Upon the ability of Russia to produce tractors the whole agricultural question turns, and upon the solution of the agricultural problem hangs the future of Russia. Hence the

tractor is invested with an almost mystical significance; when it makes its inevitable appearance upon the film, you can almost feel the audience thrilling in their seats, while an almost imperceptible "Oh," like that which greets the ascent of a rocket at a firework display, sweeps like a breeze over the crowded hall.

Finally there is Lenin. Lenin is the first man in Europe since the Roman Emperors to be deified after his death. He is in very truth a god. Busts of him are omnipresent—I was told that there were over a thousand in the shop windows of the old Neffsky Prospekt alone—round the bust there is built a small red shrine; the name is uttered with lowered voice. Godlike and with an enigmatic smile, the sturdy squat figure presides benevolently over the multifarious activities of revolutionary Russia.

III. THE LESSON.

The lesson is simple enough. In England the men of this generation have lost their religion. It has evaporated and, withdrawing, has left a vacuum. Without some cause in which to lose themselves, some creed in which to find themselves, or some loved object of value for which to sacrifice themselves, men live lives without point and purpose. Recognising nothing which can raise them out of the selfish, little pit of vanity and desire which is the self, they are led to turn their thoughts inwards to find in themselves at once the sole object of interest and the sole criterion of value. As a result they live tired and tiring lives, play solely for their own hands, and endeavour to find in self satisfaction and the gratification of sense a sufficient aim and purpose for living. The symptoms of the *malaise* in terms of disillusion, cynicism, undue introspectiveness, hysteria and neurosis are familiar and need not detain us.

I cannot convey the impression left on me by contemporary Russia better than by saying that these symptoms are entirely lacking. Whatever may be the troubles of modern Russians, they are not and are never likely to be unhappy in the way in which the modern English and Americans are unhappy. It is not merely that Russians are fully occupied, that they have plenty to do, but that the line between working for oneself and serving one's fellows, a line which here is everywhere apparent, is there completely absent. All work in Russia is the State's work, so that performing it one fulfils one's nature in service to something greater than the self.

It was a dream of Hegel's that the State could have real being, so that the individual participating in it could develop in him all that he had it in him to be, and realise a nature greater than his own. In Russia the dream has, at any rate for the moment, come true; and it has come true just in so far as the service of the workers' State for the maintenance of Socialism in Russia and its spread over the civilised world has taken on for the contemporary Russian the aspect of a religious devotion.

C. E. M. JOAD.

THE VARIETIES OF RELIGIOUS EXPRESSION.

[**Geoffrey West** has already won a fair reputation as a literary critic and biographer for all his comparative youth. He is the author of *Deucalion: The Future of Literary Criticism* in the "To-day and To-morrow" series, a contributor to the *Times Literary Supplement* and other leading literary weeklies, and is now working on an authorised biography and criticism of the life and writings of H. G. Wells viewed as aspects of a single spiritual development. We draw our readers' attention to the Note appended to this article.—EDS.]

As the study of abnormal psychology throws light upon common psychology, so the study of eccentric sects and cults illuminates the whole area of religious thought and understanding. By examining its extremities we define its limits. Such investigations are of great interest to-day, partly because the claims of traditional religion are everywhere being questioned and to an unprecedented degree set aside as the result of scientific criticism, partly because the increased facilities for world transport and communication, to say nothing of the multiplication of books, are every day bringing the peoples of various faiths into more intimate contact, and forcing mutual doubt and self-questioning upon them. To the sincerely religious man a new religion often makes a considerable appeal; habit has dulled his sense of the potentialities of his familiar faith, the new seems to offer fresh vision, profounder realisation, and dog-like he drops his one solid possession for what may prove to be little more than a shadow. Most of all is this like to happen in those countries where the Protestant tradition of the absolute spiritual responsibility of the individual has prevailed, and especially does it seem to be so in America, which in the last hundred years has given birth or a home to countless minor and some major faiths and sects.

Some of them are described in a book published last year, *The Confusion of Tongues*, by C. W. Ferguson. It is not a particularly good book. The author is evidently a young man, and his game is to make game; he has left it to the reader to bring to the book that understanding one normally expects the author to supply. But it is interesting. Most of us know something of Spiritualism, Mormonism, Christian Science, New Thought, Swedenborgianism, and Theosophy (in this case mainly the neo-Theosophy of Mrs. Besant and her followers, to which a section on Liberal Catholicism forms a fitting appendix), but we are less familiar with the various minor forms of Fundamentalism; the strict dogmas of the Dukhobors, the Mennonites, the Shakers, the Seventh Day Adventists, and the Russellites with their slogan that "Millions now living will never die"; the windy wordiness of Bahaism and some of the more talkative self-advertising Swamis and Yogis; the business methods of Mrs. Aimée Semple McPherson and the Unity School of Christianity; and the sexual eccentricities of the House of David or Buchmanism. Mr. Ferguson

has something to say on all these topics. With regard to the last, and to the whole vexed question, so important and so evasive, of the complicated relations of religion and sex, some much more interesting material is to be found in the journal of Hannah Whitall Smith, edited with a long introduction by Mrs. Ray Strachey, and published in 1928 under the title of *Religious Fanaticism*. Both journal and introduction deal with the more curious American religious sects of the nineteenth century, whereas Mr. Ferguson relates mainly but not exclusively more recent developments. From a reading of these two books either separately or together, striking conclusions emerge.

Mrs. Smith, at least, sets beyond all doubt the absolute sincerity of the followers of these cults and sects, though her experiences are set down as a warning against such eccentricities, and she is concerned practically wholly with the most extreme aberrations of the religious spirit. Yet they cannot all be accepted; many must be dismissed instantly as nonsensical, contrary to known fact, degrading or indecent even, by almost every intelligent person; and their claims, moreover, are mutually exclusive—one cannot have twenty messiahs, each the Only Son of the one true God! Nevertheless they work; each has its devotees. Believe in me and you shall find salvation, is the cry of every religious founder or leader, and it is undeniable that the promise is fulfilled—invariably someone by obeying that command finds happiness, an all-sufficing purpose for which no sacrifice, of oneself or of others, is too great. Some may allege the experiences of the follower of another prophet or faith to be, on the religious plane, false, self-deceptions, yet such experiences in innumerable cases are indistinguishable in their power to impel to that higher and more selfless living which sacrifice implies. If anyone doubts this, let him study the record of religious persecution in connection with, say, the Mormons or Dukhobors—not merely the social disfavour and mockery, but the taking away or giving up of goods, the threats of imprisonment and even to life. It would seem that there is no religion by which some man or woman may not, to his or her satisfaction, find salvation. This must be so; religion works—or it perishes. It is so, apparently, even when the prophet can be proved by later confession to be a conscious deceiver with his mind centred solely upon self-glorification, some rich disciple's money-bags, or sexual possession of his fairer followers. One may doubt the sincerity of many religious leaders; one cannot doubt that of their devotees. No sect can consist solely of charlatans, though it may of fools—a statement which demands the afterthought that we are all fools by someone else's standards!

Yet surely a strange light is cast upon the nature of all religions if teachings which are not only mutually exclusive but often consciously invented falsehoods can bring about that transcending of the limits of selfhood and that sense of union with Reality in which the self seems to be at once absorbed and extended and at the same time, so it appears, accounted for or justified, which for most people constitutes the essential religious experience. The conclusion seems unavoidable not merely that no religion can claim a monopoly of

truth but that the only applicable test is effectiveness for bringing about the experience in the individual case, and that such effectiveness depends not at all upon truth to testable fact but upon faith. So long as one believes, it is a minor matter what one believes. A religion is in itself no more than an instrument, to be employed not for its own sake but as a means to something beyond.

Startling as this viewpoint may be to some orthodox religionists, I do not see how it can be refuted. But if it be accepted, what is that something towards which each individual religion leads, however fumblingly or feebly? It is the religious experience, one and unchanging, being of its essence no more and no less than a simple experience of ultimate Unity, yet always in its expression variable and personal. There, in a sentence, we touch at once the root of the difficulties of religious jealousy and conflict and their solution.

Every religion is an expression of the religious experience. The experience may be experienced, but never apprehended intellectually, as Mr. Middleton Murry has explained in these pages; thus while it may be conveyed it cannot be stated. Intellectually regarded, every religion is an attempt to define the indefinable, and the claim of each to be the unique definition is the cause of all religious dissension. At best, as at worst, such a statement can be, in Mr. Murry's word, no more than a *perspective* of that ultimate Unity experienced; it is necessary to insist upon this, for in the wider view God, Truth, Reality, Oneness may appear in a thousand Protean guises, each one relatively, none absolutely, true.

In the light of the facts related by Mr. Ferguson and Mrs. Strachey, and testified to by all religious history, this seems the only sane attitude. If we are to accord truth to any or every religion, it must be the truth of art, the truth of the individual or partial perspective. The religion that is not the creation of one individual is that of a number of individuals, and even if we might adopt some theory of inspiration, we cannot presume a perfect interpretation from a defective instrument. We make no complaint because two artists' drawings of the same landscape, even if sketched from the same point, are not identical, nor should we because religions do not agree. They are, like the paintings, metaphors, hieroglyphs, of experience, and as such they should be judged by standards less of truth than of beauty. Their beauty is their truth. By such standards many of these sects and cults described by the two writers would, I think, earn no small measure of condemnation, not as lies conscious or unconscious, but as too little effective, or as mingling with their effectiveness degrading qualities, unacceptable limitations, physical or mental contaminations; they would be condemned, in short, on similar grounds to bad art. Tradition has in religion the same advantages (and disadvantages) as in art. The genuine innovative need is as rare in one as in the other, and in either demands actual creative genius. The ordinary man shows his good sense when he adopts the established religion of his place and time as naturally as he does its language or social

system. Still more he would show it, would he realise that his adoption of all three is but an accident of circumstance.

What we ask of the religious adherent is, in short, the recognition that his creed is not a statement but an adumbration of the truth, and that as there is no One Way in art, so there is no One Path in religion. This I take to be the true Theosophical attitude. It does not assert that there are not higher and lower religious forms. There are. But, even so, as *Tales for Tiny Tots* is better suited to the nursery reader than *Jude, the Obscure*, or *King Lear*, so are inferior religious forms sometimes best suited to the infantile spiritual consciousness. The Absolute, Keyserling says, is attainable by the realisation of *any* given possibilities. What is essential is that one should not remain in the nursery too long, believing it to be the world. The recognition suggested makes for tolerance and understanding; it abolishes the conflict between Science and Religion; it facilitates receptivity to new and higher teachings.

If Pilate indeed jested when he asked "What is Truth"? he was surely the one man in the Jerusalem of his day worthy to stand face to face with the man he came to judge. Yet though Reality must remain for ever elusive, capable of experience but never of definition, need this distress us? Need it cause us to feel abashed or ineffective that, on the scientific plane, our own conception of the universe about us may, in a thousand years or less, be matter only for the waste-paper basket? I believe not. The medieval man in the Ptolemaic earth-centred universe lived as complete a life, however different intellectually and emotionally, as anyone alive to-day. All that any of us can do or needs to do, scientifically or religiously, is to create or adopt the most suitable expression of his apprehension of Being open to him within the limits of his knowledge and psychological needs, as a dwelling wherein he may abide. But let him remember that it is no more than *his* dwelling; further, let him remember that because it suits him it is not necessarily suited to everyone or even anyone else.

GEOFFREY WEST.

A NOTE ON THE ABOVE.

Mr. Geoffrey West's comprehension of the true Theosophical position is partial, and in this, as in so many other cases, half a truth will prove more dangerous to him and his readers than a downright lie such as the fanaticism of the believer on the one hand or the negation of the unbeliever on the other. In the earlier part of his article Mr. West has made the very necessary distinction between neo-theosophy and Theosophy. We shall advance here three main ideas put forward by H. P. Blavatsky and her Indian Masters on the subject of Religion and religions, and Mr. West, and people like him, who know of the neo-theosophical attitude, will detect the basic difference between that and the attitude of true Theosophy.

(1) Writing on the problem of evil which all religions are supposed to combat, this was said by one of the Masters :—

“After making due allowance for evils that are natural and cannot be avoided,—and so few are they that I challenge the whole host of Western metaphysicians to call them evils or to trace them directly to an independent cause—I will point out the greatest, the chief cause of nearly two-thirds of the evils that pursue humanity ever since that cause became a power. It is religion under whatever form and in whatsoever nation. It is the sacerdotal caste, the priesthood and the churches; it is in those illusions that man looks upon as sacred, that he has to search out the source of that multitude of evils which is the great curse of humanity and that almost overwhelms mankind. Ignorance created Gods and cunning took advantage of the opportunity. Look at India and look at Christendom and Islam, at Judaism and Fetichism. It is priestly imposture that rendered these Gods so terrible to man; it is religion that makes of him the selfish bigot, the fanatic that hates all mankind out of his own sect without rendering him any better or more moral for it. It is belief in God and Gods that makes two-thirds of humanity the slaves of a handful of those who deceive them under the false pretence of saving them. Is not man ever ready to commit any kind of evil if told that his God or Gods demand the crime?; voluntary victim of an illusionary God, the abject slave of his crafty ministers. The Irish, Italian and Slavonian peasant will starve himself and see his family starving and naked to feed and clothe his padre and pope. For two thousand years India groaned under the weight of caste, Brahmins alone feeding on the fat of the land, and to-day the followers of Christ and those of Mahomet are cutting each other's throats in the names of and for the greater glory of their respective myths. Remember the sum of human misery will never be diminished unto that day when the better portion of humanity destroys in the name of Truth, morality, and universal charity, the altars of their false gods.”

The reader is requested to bear in mind that the above-quoted words are those of an Indian Sage, one most highly revered by all who have known him.

Shall we then labour to smash all religions in the spirit of disbelief? Disbelief is as bad as blind-belief. If men were to use their enquiring minds to find out how religious beliefs originate instead of turning sceptics and abandoning all beliefs, they would agree with the view which we quote below. A superficial examination of the kind such as is found in the volumes to which Mr. West refers will not suffice.

(2) "It is from this WISDOM-RELIGION that all the various individual 'Religions' (erroneously so called) have sprung, forming in their turn offshoots and branches, and also all the minor creeds, based upon and always originated through some personal experience in psychology. Every such religion, or religious offshoot, be it considered orthodox or heretical, wise or foolish, started originally as a clear and unadulterated stream from the Mother-Source. The fact that each became in time polluted with purely human speculations and even inventions, due to interested motives, does not prevent any from having been pure in its early beginnings. There are those creeds—we shall call them religions—which have now been overlaid with the human element out of all recognition; others just showing signs of early decay; not one that escaped the hand of time. But each and all are of divine, because natural and true origin; aye—Mazdeism, Brahmanism, Buddhism as much as Christianity."

These are the words of H. P. Blavatsky. All our readers will be well advised to study carefully her article "Is Theosophy a Religion?" from which the above is extracted. The whole article is now available in pamphlet form.

Now it is the duty of the sincere followers of every religion to be courageous and test out their respective beliefs by the light of common sense, reason and unprejudiced judgment. When the "pollutions" are removed from each great religion, the pure remains of one will be found to be identical with those of every other faith.

(3) The next step should be to seek the source of these religious truths born under various climates, in times with which history refuses to deal. "If coming events are said to cast their shadows before, past events cannot fail to leave their impress behind them. It is, then, by those shadows of the hoary Past and their fantastic silhouettes on the external screen of every religion and philosophy, that we can, by checking them as we go along, and comparing them, trace out finally the body that produced them." (*Secret Doctrine II*, 794).

It is the consideration of the ideas implied in the above extracts which yield the truly Theosophical attitude. Almost invariably religious men are victims of their psychic vagaries; rarely are they spiritual. Between the religious man and the spiritual man lies the gulf of knowledge, knowledge which eradicates the many paths, ways and by-ways, and establishes the Single File of the ageless Seers from the far-off past to the far-off future.

THE LIVING POWER OF HINDUISM.

[Prof. C. A. Krishnamurti, M. A., F. R. Econ. S., has written with feeling on the power and potency, the charm and beauty, of Sanatana Dharma (Eternal Religion) as real Hinduism should be known.—Eds.]

Hinduism is recognized to be a world-religion with a large following. It includes within its fold the highest philosophy as the coarsest demon-worship. It is the oldest of the living religions. But one is puzzled about the secret of its structure and vitality. With the greatest disruptive forces from within and subtle and organized attacks from without, it is a wonder that it is still as strong as ever.

To a well-informed foreigner, Hinduism is the Veda and the Upanishads, the Gita and the Epics; to others, it is the caste-system idol-worship and untouchability; to still others, it is the temple, and the car with nude figures; the Sadhu and the Fakir; the purdah and the widow; the caste mark, the ritual and the drums; some or all of these. But the truth is otherwise and elsewhere.

The first feature of Hinduism is the element of permanence in it. The very first utterances of the Rig Veda were inspired by recollections of the intimations of immortality with the glory and the freshness of a dream; and Heaven lay about the infancy of the Indo-Aryan race which began to "read the eternal deep haunted for ever by the eternal mind and those obstinate questionings of sense and outward things." From the very start their souls "had sight of that immortal sea which brought us hither". The Persian and the Greek, the Kushan and the Scythian, the Hun and the Arab, the Mongol and the European have come and gone, or stayed stirring its depths, bursting an embankment here, or raising a sand-bank there. But yet, Hinduism and Hindu society have flowed on for ever, like the mighty Ganges in its eternal bed.

At no time and nowhere else have two hundred millions of men, women and children systematically been brought up to think of this world as transient, the soul as immortal, life as probationary, the movements of the individual to be controlled not from without but from within, the senses to be subdued earthwise and inflamed Godward. Not that they were homogeneous in any sense; linguistic, racial and religious diversity ran riot in India as nowhere else. But Hinduism had a genius for absorbing and transforming with ease ideals and groups without sacrificing the individuality of the part or the whole. This capacity for absorption has been accompanied by a unique vitality that has been put to the crucial test, time and again, whenever a new invading mass entered the land, or an Allaudin ravaged or an Aurangzeb displayed his destructive zeal. But the flame of Hinduism only burned the brighter the more violently it was shaken. The Islamic axe raised against this Sanatana tree made it but blossom

anew; and the Renaissance between the twelfth and the sixteenth centuries covered the whole land with indigenous verdure breathing a rare classic fragrance through the lyrics of Kabir and Tulasidas in the North, Purandaradas and Kallakadas in the Karnataka, and the Tamil saints in the South.

Hinduism showed its vitality in another way also. Separatist movements, however strong, were temporary, and were followed by the intelligent play of cohesive forces under the auspices, strangely enough, of the followers of the other faith—Nanak, Kabir and Akbar—a fakir, a weaver, and an emperor. The attitude of Hinduism towards its rivals is interesting, differing in different ages. Islam did not encourage or invite an intellectual duel, its argument being the sword. But the long contact with Hindu culture had produced in the fullness of time a mutual difference and a wise realisation of the ultimate oneness of Allah and Rama. Nanak, Kabir and Akbar were pioneers in Indian nation-building on foundations of communal harmony, built with cultural and not political or electoral bricks and mortar. With such a history and with such powers of absorption Hindu society has become a congress of ethnographical, credal, philosophical and cultural representatives of all climes, ages, and stages of civilised existence; a confederacy and not a unitary state, with a constitution that is unwritten and elastic but distinctively Aryan. Another important feature of Hinduism is that it has no church, its priesthood is sharply divided in methods and details but united in fundamentals. It is not a preaching religion but exerts a silent influence on others. Attacks provoke a shrug or smile but never a surrender of its individuality. It attempts no self defence, indifferent to its being understood correctly or at all by other than its followers.

How then have such mutually repellent particles, so vaguely and loosely organised, been held together? There bonds of union as well as walls of separation exist. A geographical unity has been enforced by mountain and sea with abundant internal diversity. The ancient lore of the Veda and the Purana, legend and epic is common and familiar to the Kashmiri and the Bengali, the Gujarati and the Madrasi. Nay, it has at all times attracted men who were foreigners in every sense of the term—an Alberuni, an Akbar, a Max Müller, and a Sylvain Levi. The ideals embodied in it have been made available to the masses by interpretative geniuses like Kabir and others of the Renaissance. The Gita and the Panchatantra are All-India institutions; and while the surface was often seething with the boiling forces of disintegration, there has always flowed an under-current of unity born of a subconscious spiritual kinship.

The highest works of philosophy and religion were intelligible only to the learned who, however, were responsible for a form of popular and universal education, undertaken voluntarily, through the vernaculars in which everywhere there was to be found a rare outburst of devotional poetry and song. The moral story illustrative of high ideals, told by the voice of affection, melted the heart, moulded the lives, leaving a frame of mind "breathless with adoration". How

many Harischandras and Damayanthis can we not find to-day in Hindu society, though their number is dwindling, for obvious reasons ?

The methods of Hinduism for preserving and propagating itself are very ingenious, dispensing with elaborate or costly accessories. Each locality had its temple with its round of festivals attracting a congregation. The festival was local or provincial or national, monthly, annual, or once in twelve years ; the greater the interval the greater the gathering and its impressiveness. Pilgrimages, mostly undertaken on foot, imparted mobility and education to the population. It is really wonderful how effective was the intercourse, in the days of Asoka, not only internally but also with distant Europe, Central Asia, and China, that India was maintaining.

There were excellent contrivances, calculated to disarm time and distance, to keep a family and a group well-knit and maintain connections between the past and the present. Birth and death in a family were signalled by the members and the collateral branches commemorating the event by untouchability for ten days. Each man was to know and pronounce three times a day his Gothra which traced his relationship to some Rigvedic Rishi. Extracts from the Vedic hymns were to be recited thrice a day, and longer portions on ceremonial occasions. The communal memory was an excellent receptacle and vehicle of learning, carrying it down the long drawn vale of Time. Under such conditions, ephemeral literature could not thrive or multiply as at present.

Such education could be imparted to and by only a few. A process of natural selection brought the earnest disciple to the right teacher with the happiest results. There was then no slaughter of the innocents, no waste pointed out by the Hartog Committee, no failure in life, no unemployment of the educated.

In the family elders were looked up to ; births and deaths and marriages were occasions for the family to gather. The daughter had rights, not of inheritance but of special consideration, gifts of land at marriage and other gifts at other times. She was periodically brought to the parental home. The maternal uncle plays an important part on occasions of marriage. Thus an unbroken relationship was maintained between the female and male lines. The village community was an unparalleled system of mutual service and interdependence, making the village a self-sufficient unit. The merest barber could bring the communal function to a stand-still by striking for not receiving the customary honours.

The historical and the chronological sense showed itself peculiarly. The *Yuga* with its division, the locality, the *saka* or the era, the year, the half-year, the *ritu* or the season, the month, the fortnight, the day, the *nakshatram* or the position of the moon in the Zodiac, had all to be repeated every day by every one. The first of every lunar and solar month was observed with due ceremonies, the names of the ancestors dead being pronounced and offerings of *jalam* and *thilam*, water and grain made.

The new born child was named after the grandparent. All names were after some name of God, providing endless opportunities to pronounce His name. There were other ways of reminding one of the omnipresence, omnipotence, and omniscience of God. At every stage in eating and drinking His name was to be pronounced. Various forms of Deity were to be recognised in various items of food and things around us. The man of business need not divert his attention from his business to God ; but he can regard every act of his as service rendered to Him ; the food eaten, an offering to Him ; the walking he does, so many *pradakshinams* or goings around Him ; the words spoken, His praise ; the lying down for sleep, prostrations to Him ; Thus he has to fill his being with *Shakthi*—spirit immersion—through which he can attain *Mukthi*, liberation from the ills to which this flesh is heir, and the attaining of a poise which is *Sat, Chit and Ananda*—goodness, brightness and bliss. Nay, more, he has to see His presence pervade the universe, all space, coeval with and transcending Time. The rising sun is to be offered as burning camphor at His altar, the flowing waters, the blowing winds, the lightning—all so many offerings of worship. Grumble not at the seasons' difference ; blame not another ; see Him alone in everything, everywhere, and every moment. Such is the frame of mind developed in Hinduism.

Life was artistic and, in simplicity, sublime. The queen of the home adorned it with figures of exquisite design, drawn by hands in themselves artistic. Flowers were intertwined in the dark tresses of the youthful maiden whose bright forehead showed the delicate intrusion of the vermillion dot or vertical line. Charity and hospitality were enjoined on all.

Life was lived in the company of nature as far as conditions permitted. *Ushas*, the dawn, was welcomed with the body purified by the twilight bath. Festivals moved in harmony with the seasons. The full moon day of the month of *Magha* at the threshold of Spring is dedicated to Kama, the God of Love. Open air festivals are held while the Jasmine is in full bloom, and the South wind is blowing. The full moon day of *Karthika* to which Kalidas refers as "*Sarath Chandra Chandrika*" is given over to illuminations.

Sanitary rules were better observed than to-day. No one was to spit in a public place or in water. Sexual relations were very well regulated. Women other than one's wife were to be regarded as one's sisters ; and marriage was regarded as a highly religious bond. The relations between the rulers and the ruled imposed mutual obligations. The point is that such regulations, so difficult of observance, were of universal application without the aid of the press or the platform.

The life of the individual was regulated from birth. Learning was to begin in the fifth year. Mental, spiritual and physical discipline was to commence from the seventh year. Marriage (for a higher purpose) was not entered into until after the twenty-second year. After the age of fifty a man is to prepare to retire from wordly affairs. At sixty, he must disencumber himself totally and become a *Sanyasin*.

Hinduism is not asceticism, but every Hindu is an ascetic, without an ascetic's garb, and even living in a city's central roar.

Life is not an end in itself, but a means to a higher end. *Gnana*, *Bhakthi*, and *Vairagya*—wisdom, spirit-immersion, and a detachment as of the water-drop on the lotus-leaf were to be practised by every Hindu. The perpetual struggle with, and ultimate conquest over, the six enemies within (Arishadvarga)—*Kama*, *Krodha*, *Lobha*, *Moha*, *Mada* and *Mathsarya*—Passion, Hatred, Miserliness, Seductive illusions, Self-conceit and Envy—formed the duty of all and the path to happiness and peace—the Aryan Path—which imposes no limitations of armaments but regulation of individual and collective activities. Only such food and avocations were to be resorted to as did not inflame or misguide individual or collective passions.

So formed and framed, political vicissitudes have left Hinduism unaffected in essentials. It has responded to the Time-spirit. The contact of Hinduism with the Christian church in India to-day constitutes an unparalleled experiment in the realm of Humanity and Religion. That Gandhi has been acclaimed as the modern Christ is paying the highest tribute of praise to Hinduism.

And what of the future? With science and industry run to excess, Hinduism, built on the "human heart by which we live," will tread the Aryan Path leading the rest of the war-worn world. Science and industry Hinduism will make her own with characteristic energy, but without the intoxication of success. India alone knows how to bear the successes as the evils of life. There are already the harbingers of the new dawn—Raman and Bose, Tagore and Gandhi—all Hindu to the core; the first two have taken their place among the leading scientists of the day. Tagore challenges, in the interests of Humanity, the superiority of the civilisation of the West built on armaments and diplomacy; Gandhi proves the superiority and the eternity of the soul and its force.

C. A. KRISHNAMURTI.

WISDOM OF THE FOREST.

[**Bruno Lasker**, German by birth, engaged himself in Social research in England and went to America fifteen years ago where he is promulgating new methods of Social education, and is the Secretary of "The Inquiry." He was at one time assistant editor of *The Survey*, to which paper, among others, he frequently contributes. He is the author of *Race Attitudes in Children*. Of himself he writes that "he never graduated from anything; that his master-works are for the most part hidden in foot-notes or acknowledged in the prefaces of other peoples' books."

It is not a new imagery which Mr. Lasker is using to depict the great fact of Interdependence which makes the whole of Nature kin.

The forest was used as the symbol of the Macrocosm as of Man, the Microcosm. Thus in the *Anugita*, chapter xii, an occult teaching is imparted. Of the forest it says "there is nothing else more delightful than that, when there is no distinction from it. There is nothing more afflicting than that, when there is a distinction from it." Interested students will find an explanation of it in H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*, II. pp. 637-638.

Again, the *Vishnu Purana* (I. 15) narrates how at a particular period "the world was overrun with trees" while the Prachetasas were absorbed in their devotion: "trees spread and over-shadowed the unprotected earth; and the people perished.....unable to labour for ten thousand years,"—which is a reference to adepts of the left hand path. But beneficent Trees also exist in the forest—Initiates and Adepts of the Good Law: thus Jesus is called the Tree of Life, and throughout Asia Minor They were called the "Trees of Righteousness" and also the "Cedars of Lebanon."

For the student of genuine Occultism the Forest and its trees are symbols worth meditating upon.—Eds.]

The forest is more than a collection of trees. It is a community with needs and desires and purposes vastly larger than those of the individual organisms that compose it. It has its struggle for survival—but not in the sense of each against all, not a struggle of each species for itself alone no matter at what cost to the others. Rather, we have here, as throughout nature, the symptom called symbiosis; the mutual accommodation and adaptation of different forms of life.

Walk observantly through the forest; and you will find a new meaning for survival of the fittest. Not that tree is the fittest to survive—if indeed we can imagine such a tree—that is trying to displace other trees so as to secure a maximum of nourishment from soil and air. But survival means dependency. Not only different species of plants, but also plants and animals, and different species of animals, engage with each other in enterprises for the common benefit. This process in nature has been called mutual aid; but is much more than that, for it implies common purposes to such an extent that often one form of life cannot exist without the other.

Nor does each generation stand by itself and live for itself. There is an unending link from generation to generation, and at no moment can you say of the virgin forest that it is young or adolescent or mature. Within itself it contains all ages, a changeless sequence of birth and death. The tree grows from the seedling, matures and dies. Each

year it sheds its leaves and adds to the soil that surrounds it and feeds its roots. Finally the trunk falls, the wood rots, and the life of the tree, as tree, is at an end. But while it lived the tree was of the forest ; it helped to protect a multitude of organisms which, in turn, enriched the soil, fought off the tree's enemies, made up, together with this tree and many other trees, a living community of which no single inhabitant could be removed without damage to the whole. That forest lives on ; and the death of the individual tree in its ripeness of age is of no consequence.

The cells in our bodies make up such a community too. When in health we pay no particular attention to the individual cell. We are not concerned for the welfare of an individual cell in our body, except in its relation to the whole ; the cell does not struggle for individual survival but willingly, it would seem, plays its part and eventually dies so that the larger organism, the human body, may have life.

Human society, likewise, in older and simpler days, had its accepted symbiosis ; and the idea so prevalent to-day that the individual is the supreme purpose and master of his life would have seemed unthinkable foolish. In East and West alike, progress was the slow achievement of generations linked together by mutuality of purpose, experiment, co-operation. Our reading of history is a grotesque perversion of the truth if we see in it no more than a succession of individual fortunes and of combats between great soldiers and statesmen. Not even saints and scholars could have influenced our cultures as profoundly as they did except in so far as they were members of continuing brotherhoods and deeply conscious of their links with the life of the people, past and contemporary. Always, since prehistoric times, men have lived in communities ; and each community, even in the remotest jungles of central Africa, has its rigorous laws and recognized rights and duties of mutuality.

Nor has there, in the long history of human evolution, been a time when different classes or castes, different religious communities or sects, different clans or other groups have been able to advance their own prosperity without regard for that of others. Only in periods of highest integration of purpose between the different sections of society has culture flourished, has human happiness been founded in security.

To regain this joyous symbiosis must now as ever be the effort of thoughtful men and women in every class, race, profession, nationality. And each act of aggression against the common good they will see as symptom of a malady. The tree does not talk grandiosely about the forest, then crowd out his neighbour ! There lies the secret of wisdom in the adjustment of each to all, in the co-ordination of different rhythms of life—so that the seasons find a single mighty pattern of community upon which to embroider their magic spell. Not loss of identity, but its enhancement through the synthesis of many identities ; not a single low note of equality and likeness, but an orchestra of concerted strains !

BRUNO LASKER.

THE LORDS OF MAYA.

[**Occultus** is already introduced to our readers.—Eds.]

The spirit in the body is often called the imprisoned soul. This earth is often called the only veritable hell that there is. Both these statements are true of the ordinary man. The Perfected Man is not imprisoned by the body; voluntary exile from Nirvana, the Soul of Space, He retains a freedom even though He uses a body for His own purposes. The hell aspect of Earth does not touch Him, though He lives and labours here for the sake of all the souls held in bondage on earth. The damnation of these souls lies in their ignorance about their bondage. Thus they create for themselves their own hell. This ignorance or *avidya* is illusion or *maya*.

We might say that there are three kinds of human beings—(1) those who live on earth and know not that they are in hell; (2) those who recognise that life on earth is a state of imprisonment and bondage; and (3) those who living on earth are yet free, are untouched by the magic power—*maya-shakti*—which makes of earth a hell. This last class consists of the Masters who have mastered all the secrets of colour, sound, smell, taste and sensation, and subdued their own senses and minds.

Most men belong to the first class: the glamour of tints and shades, the enchantment of odours and scents, the haunting and ob-
sessing quality of tones and sounds, the enslaving power of tastes, of sensations, of feelings, of thoughts—all overwhelm puny man. The more he heeds them, the more he goes away from himself. He loses his *own* power to know, in the thoughts and ideas of other people, and these so enchain his mind that it forgets to turn in the direction of his Self. He attunes his ears to fleshly sounds and the note of his soul is not heard. The riot of colours blinds him to the colour of his own being;—thus in the many directions of sense life, till a divorcement takes place between the soul and its vehicle, the latter becoming a passive medium and automatic repository of outer influences. All mediums tend in a direction opposite to perfection. The spiritualistic medium is the flower and apotheosis of mediumism, generally speaking, in which our race is enveloped.

For all men there are three paths. First, the path of Maya which keeps men wedded to Maya, tied to a life of senses and lusts, finally leading them through mediumism to utter forgetfulness of the soul or self. They hug the shell of Maya and are absorbed by it. This is why this path is sometimes called the path of Annihilation.

The second path is the path of Abandonment. This awakens man so far as to desire to reject Maya and run away from its pain. Such abandonment results in the innocence and happiness of the

sweet but ignorant child. He who runs away from the shadow of Maya is pursued by it. Men may try to feel that they have succeeded in abandoning Maya; it never abandons them.

The third path is the path of Fulfilment, on which Maya's power is recognized, its secrets are learned, and it itself is mastered. This path is also called the Path of Woe because in all three stages—of recognizing, learning and mastering—there is pain and suffering. To recognize that we have been under foolish glamour, that we have been wasting time and polluting space, is a painful awakening. More painful still is the effort to wrest out of Maya-Devi her well guarded secrets. She wraps herself in the many folds of her *sari* of matter; she hides herself in veils of varied textures and colours. Long are the years and hard is the labour which she claims, and frustrations innumerable cause anxiety and anguish and untold suffering. But at last conquering the soul of Maya, man rises above pain and pleasure—Maya's lord and master.

Thus for those who awaken from the glamorous sleep of illusion the path bifurcates—abandon everything and everybody, and in solitary glory lose your soul in the Bliss of Ages; or fulfill your dharma in pain, in sorrow, in woe, controlling Maya, remaining beside her, her master, in order to help her victims to find and walk that same path of fulfilment.

On the first path, the Path of Maya, teachers are many who impart the knowledge of how to die but not the knowledge of how to live; they impart knowledge of the body, the feelings, the mind, how these constantly change and change and change. Variety and difference of views is the keynote of these teachers, and inconsistency the great characteristic by which they may be known.

On the second path, the Path of Abandonment, there are no gurus. Those who are slaves of Maya cannot teach how to abandon her; those who have abandoned her are not here; they are running, running, running to find a spot where Maya's sway is not.

On the Path of Fulfilment, the third path, and on it alone, are the real gurus to be found. Having mastered Maya-Devi, They alone are capable of showing us how *we* can also master her. They master her by making obeisance to her laws of infallible justice and using those laws to serve humanity. Serving her, They alone can teach us how to serve. They are changeless and reposeful, for They know the secrets of Life; They are immortal and eternal in whom death has died again and again. All such are of one mind and are united in Will. They have a constant mission and a consistent message. They speak the language of colour and sound; They know the number underlying each form. They have fathomed the ultimate divisions of Time or cycles which make days and nights of mortals, of Gods, but above all, of Maya-Devi, who is the cause of the coming and going of universes; and thus They are not disturbed at the time of general dissolution. They are awake when all else sleeps.

They smile in compassion at men who chase the shade of Maya and watch earnestly those who are pursued by the shadow of Maya, while They hold in trust for all the Soul of Maya—whom They have subdued through service.

To conquer Maya one must seek the Lords of Maya.

OCCULTUS.

THE CHANGING MIND OF THE RACE.

Theosophical students are well aware that the teachings embodied in the doctrines of Karma and Reincarnation are rapidly gaining credence and popularity. Gradually the profounder aspects of these Laws as well as the deeper teaching of Theosophy regarding the origin and destiny of man, the genesis and death of planets, solar systems and sidereal universes are also diluting and thus purifying the refuse of current superstition and materialistic thinking. Therefore it is interesting to note certain significant passages which have appeared in Mr. Booth Tarkington's latest novel *Mirthful Haven*.

While Mr. Tarkington usually writes in a light and humorous vein, he possesses unusual penetrative faculties which see into the motives and aspirations of American youth. That he has also a deeper side is seen in the words he puts into the mouth of one of his characters, a Captain Embury, an old mariner of the Yankee clipper-ship era.

"Why, it's as plain as day," the Captain went on; "... the Chinese worship many Gods; they say there are hundreds and hundreds of 'em and I believe they're right, because there are hundreds and hundreds of universes—some of 'em thousands of times bigger than this one we're in, and awful far apart. . . . The star Algol would be dreadful far away for our God; Algol must have a God of its own. Every universe must have its own God—that's why I think the Chinese are right, and these hundreds and hundreds of universes all have their own Gods. How can anybody think any other way?"

"So every man makes vast his own image," Warbeck whispered. "It's a gorgeous picture—unthinkable black space traversed by the shining universes, each with his own Captain commanding from a quarter-deck of blazing suns! The infinite void of Cosmos an ocean for Captains to navigate eternally!"

"Way out there on Argol," the Captain was saying, "learned characters are lecturin' likely, on how this earth of ours was made of polypuses that swam all over it. If they can see us through their telescopes, guess they wonder why we behave to each other the cussed way we do sometimes. Must think we need all the disciplining we get, and I guess we do!"

Theosophy teaches man is an epitome of great nature. He is in fact a small universe in himself and, what better destiny than that he become really the Captain of his Universe, navigating the waters of life and existence throughout eternity.

B. T.

ISLAM AND THE GITA.

[Rama Swarup Shastri is the Sanskrit Professor of the Muslim University at Aligarh.—EDS.]

My object in this paper is to trace the connection between Islam and the *Bhagavad-Gita*. It is necessary to establish a connection between the Aryan and the Arabian civilizations. Saporta stated that the origin of the human race is to be traced to the northern regions of the globe. For later epochs Professor Max Müller concluded that the Vedic language was the first known language of humanity. Mr. Tilak after examining the astronomy, astrology, language, creed and cult of the primitive Aryan stock came to the definite conclusion that the Arctic region was the home of the Vedas and of the people who spoke the Vedic language.

Astro-Geographical considerations and the traditional story of succeeding *avantaras*, as prevalent among Hindus, force the conclusion upon us that there was a time when, of all the dispersing and decaying races, the Aryan race was the only one going through its cycle of rise and ascendancy. It is not, therefore, a matter of surprise and wonder that the civilised races of the world to-day have been influenced and inspired by the culture of the primitive Aryans. Naturally the Arabs, before they were converted to Islam, had many ideas and institutions in common with the old Aryans and the present Hindus of India.

It is an admitted fact that before the Arabs were converted to Islam, there was a brisk trade between India and Transoxiana Turkistan and Bukhara, well-known business markets of the then world.

Thus it is no wonder that the Arabs before their conversion were influenced by Northern Christianity, by Neoplatonism, as well as by the doctrines of the Indian Sankhya, Vedanta and Yoga. Thus imbued, it is no surprise that Islam from the very start developed systems of mysticism which are only a transmutation of the pantheistic Vedanta of India migrating with missionaries, with caravans and *kafilas* of Buddhist and pre-Buddhist India; but the passage lay through Kabul, Quandhar, Bagdad and Iran, and it is thus that a fusion took place between the cultures and civilisation emanating from India and reaching the borders of Arabia and penetrating further to the countries of the Mediterranean sea-board. This is meant merely to point out what was the basic structure of that which later became Islam.

Now within this new body the signs and symptoms of *Tasauwuf* or mysticism lay inherent, inasmuch as the meaning of the *Kalama* itself was soon after its promulgation interpreted in a mystic sense by the religious scholars of Islam. Sekh Abdul Kadir Gilani, the

founder of the Kadria order of mystics and Sheikh Mahiuddin ibni Arbi, one of the greatest scholars, taught a philosophy of life which was not essentially different from Hindu Philosophy.

Sheikh Shahbuddin Shuharwardi is another great person of the Sufi persuasion who founded the Suhwardi order of Islamic mystics. Mansoor bin Hilaj, one of the early Muslim mystics, has a much closer affinity with the Yogis of India than with the formal scholars of his own creed who put him to death.

The *Gita*, however, does not appear to have been known to the Muslim mystics, or is not referred to by them. But this much can be fairly inferred, that whatever inspired the *Gita*, also inspired Sufism and the recognised mystics of Islam, such as Sheikh Mahiuddin of Ajmere and Shaikh Nizamuddin Aulia. His *Quarif* is accepted as one of the most authoritative expositions of Muslim mysticism and any one who desires may satisfy himself about the close similarity between his teachings and those of his Hindu predecessors.

The existence and the upward struggle of the soul was first appreciated in definite fashion by the Indian Rishis, whose influence even to-day extends with the extension of knowledge and of civilization from land to land, from continent to continent, from heaven to earth, and back again, from earth to heaven. This may appear emotional, but the subject is such that, being a Hindu and a Pandit of the old orthodox order, I cannot restrain myself in the presence of the heart-filling concept of *Humaost* or *Sarvam Khalu Idam Brahm*—"all this is nought else but Brahm."

Naturally my prayer to my Hindu brethren is that, when they read the *Bhagavad-Gita*, they should also take to heart all the lessons that Alberuni as a Mohamman, as a *Momin*, and as a Master has to teach about the *Gita*. The first volume of Alberuni's *India* edited with notes by G. C. Sachau will be found a very useful handbook.

Abu Raihan Alberuni, the greatest Muslim scholar who has ever studied the science and the philosophy of the Hindus, repeatedly refers to the *Gita* and quotes it at length. He gives parallel passages from the sayings of Lord Krishna and the precepts of the leading Sufis, particularly of Shaikh Bayazid of Bustam. A sentence of Vyas is twice quoted by him with great appreciation.

Learn twenty-five [canons of life].....as you learn a logical syllogism, and something which is a certainty not merely studying with the tongue.....Afterwards adhere to whatever religion you like ; your end will be salvation.

I am diffident and really apprehensive as to whether I have pleased my Muslim friends or if I have offended my Hindu brethren, but I know that sacrifice is the weight of truth and whatever I hold true in this connection I do herewith express without the hope of reward and without the fear of any censure.

RAMA SWARUP SHASTRI.

UNDER HEAVEN ONE FAMILY.

THE HUMANITARIAN WORK OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

[**Arthur Davies** is a familiar name among Indian students as the late Principal, Law College, Madras, where he was chief from 1913 to 1927. Many an Indian student leaving for residence in the various countries of Europe and in the United States has reason to remember the assistance and advice received from Mr. Davies. Since his retirement he has been connected with the Student Department of the Office of the High Commissioner for India. He is on the Editorial Staff of the League of Nations Union in London.

We are inclined to agree with Mr. Davies that the most valuable achievements of the League will be in the sphere of social and humanitarian matters rather than in that of politics.

This is one of the articles promised in our comments on Lord Parmoor's contribution in our January number.—EDS.]

The outstanding fact of this twentieth century is that the World has become a physical unity in a way that it has never been before. A single illustration will suffice. It took from fourteen to sixteen days for a courier from Rome to reach Julius Cæsar in Britain. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the journey took just as long. To-day an aeroplane covers the same distance in six hours, while news can be flashed round the entire globe almost instantaneously. The World has reacted to this new governing fact of its existence by inventing the League of Nations. Till quite recently the nations have lived very largely each for itself. Now that they touch at a thousand points they can no longer do so. The League has set before it a double task—to prevent War in spite of the real or imaginary antagonistic interests of the different nations that are now in such proximity; and to foster the spirit of co-operation between them. There are indeed different aspects of one common purpose, to realize the ideal expressed in a Chinese proverb—"Under Heaven, one family." Differences, inequalities, varieties of gifts and talents, will persist—but so far from causing bitterness, envy and hostility, they may be used to create a real World Brotherhood of Nations, in which the very diversities become the opportunity of a truer and fuller Unity.

Many people know only of the political work of the League. Perhaps its most valuable achievements will prove to be those it is accomplishing in the sphere of social and humanitarian matters. Take, for instance, the question of opium. No nation can, under modern conditions, solve the problem of the manufacture of, and trade in, this dangerous drug without the aid and co-operation of other nations. Conferences have been held under the auspices of the League, and as a result of them Governments have by joint and harmonious action been enabled to exercise a real, if not yet fully effective, control over the traffic. A Central Board has been established at

Geneva to co-ordinate the efforts of the separate States. India may be justly proud of the part she is playing in this work for the world's welfare. In 1927, at a sacrifice of about £1,000,000 annual revenue, she resolved to reduce her exports by ten per cent each year till, in 1937, they are to become completely extinguished, except for such small quantity as may be required for strictly medical and scientific purposes. Persia is also reducing her poppy growing. The willingness of China to help in a similar way has been seriously hampered by the unhappy political unrest of the last fifteen years. Next year there is to be a new Opium Conference at Geneva. In preparation for this a League Commission of Enquiry is now taking evidence of the facts about Opium Smoking and the nature and extent of the illicit traffic in the Far East. Their itinerary includes Burma, Straits Settlements, Java, Sumatra, British Borneo, the Philippines, Siam, French Indo-China, Hong Kong and other parts.

Take a single item in the magnificent work that is being done all over the world by the League's Health Organisation—work that is all the more valuable because it makes the experience and means of the more powerful and scientifically advanced nations available for the service of those that are less wealthy and worse equipped. Singapore is perhaps the most important shipping centre in the East. Its harbour welcomes ships from every part of the World, carrying passengers and merchandise, and also unhappily at times the germs of cholera, small-pox or plague. In 1925 the Health Organisation established a Bureau there. This is now in constant communication with 140 other ports in the East, who by wireless and the telegraph keep it in touch with every outbreak of epidemics in their own vicinities and in the ships that visit them. This information is passed on at once to all Governments and Health Organisations concerned, and immediate measures by quarantine and otherwise are taken to extirpate or prevent the spread of disease.

Another example of the humanitarian work of the League may be taken from what it has done, and is doing, to prevent the traffic in women for immoral purposes. Modern civilisation, linking the ends of the World together, has vastly increased the scope of, and the facility for, this abominable business. Thirty-four States attended a League Conference on the subject at Geneva in 1921, and a Convention followed by which thirty-three Governments have agreed to co-operate in increasing the penalties against traffickers and strengthening their administrative procedure to eradicate the traffic. Later still, with the aid of a generous gift of £15,000 from the American Bureau of Social Hygiene, a thorough enquiry by trained experts in 112 selected cities, situated in Europe, Northern Africa and Latin America, revealed the vast and secret ramifications of the trade. Many things have been made clear by the Report of this Committee. The most important is that the "licensed house" is shown to be the essential centre of the trade. The League has therefore commenced a vigorous campaign, and several countries, *e.g.*, Germany and Hungary, have, at the League's suggestion, abolished them altogether, while others, *e.g.*, France and Japan, are considering whether they can do likewise.

It is known that the traffic exists in India and other Asiatic countries, and it has been decided that a commission of enquiry is to be sent out by the League within the next year or two to study the problem as it arises in the East.

It is felt that these illustrations present a very incomplete picture. Whole branches of the League's humanitarian work—such as that of Child Welfare—are altogether omitted, and of what is treated only bare samples are shown. Perhaps, however, enough has been said to show that real efforts are being made and some tangible results are being achieved in fulfilment of the League's ideal of a World united in co-operative service.

ARTHUR DAVIES.

[We draw the attention of those interested to the problem of Capital Punishment dealt with in the two articles which follow. Is not the subject worthy of consideration by the League of Nations? —EDS.]

If a Brotherhood or even a number of Brotherhoods may not be able to prevent nations from occasionally cutting each other's throats—still unity in thought and action, and philosophical research into the mysteries of being, will always prevent some, while trying to comprehend that which has hitherto remained to them a riddle, from creating additional causes in a world already so full of woe and evil. Knowledge of Karma gives the conviction that if—

“....virtue in distress, and vice in triumph
Make atheists of mankind,”

it is only because that mankind has ever shut its eyes to the great truth that man is himself his own saviour as his own destroyer.

H. P. BLAVATSKY—*Secret Doctrine*, I. 644.

CONCERNING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

[Below we print two articles on the evils of capital punishment : the first gives the exoteric view, the other the occult.—Eds.]

I. ABOLITION SUCCEEDS.

[**Charles Duff** is the author of *A Handbook on Hanging* and has to his credit substantial work in the cause of a much needed reform.—Eds.]

Capital Punishment still survives throughout the British Empire, with the exception of Queensland, and in forty of the forty-eight states of the American Union. A few days before this article was written, the English Home Office submitted to a Select Committee of the House of Commons now considering the problem a Memorandum which contained, I should say, at least a dozen errors of fact, and offered opinions and conclusions apparently drawn from this information. How can the ordinary man or woman arrive at a sensible decision, if he or she is to be guided by reasoning which cannot possibly be right, because it is based upon false information and false promises? The truth of the matter is known to a few people who have taken the trouble to pursue their investigations with some regard to method and without the common prejudices, and in the last few years these seekers after truth have been able to impart some of their findings to the public concerned. It is of a nature to cause the gravest misgivings to those who have hitherto unfalteringly and honestly supported the legalised killing of murderers.

It is not possible here to write all that is now known concerning the working of capital punishment in those parts of the world where it is still retained. Much of the available information is of so harrowing a nature, so nauseating and so shocking to the decent feelings of humanity, that it would outrage the readers of *THE ARYAN PATH* were it to be given. It is an appalling fact that governments everywhere can find only the most degraded types of men to be executioners: brutalised and insensate wretches of little or no skill. Hence bungled hangings and botched electrocutions—fiendish torture and cruel spectacles in this twentieth century.

But apart from this side of the question one may consider the general ethics of capital punishment and ask if the official killing of one human being by another is justifiable, amongst Christian nations, in the face of Christ's explicit commandment, *Thou shalt not kill*. Amongst those who claim to be Christians, it is blatant hypocrisy to retain capital punishment and at the same time pretend to respect the simple, unequivocal tenets of the Master.

There are indeed many broad and generously-minded men and women who have never seriously considered the problem of capital punishment, perhaps because it has never come to their notice in all

its stark brutality. Therefore, they do not fully appreciate what it means. I confess that I myself left others to worry about it until the year 1917, when I was serving with the British Army in France. I can never forget my feelings when I was told that I was to be one of a firing squad that was to execute in cold blood a nervous wreck of a man who had been found guilty of the greatest crime which a soldier can commit—desertion in the face of the enemy. I was not at that period in a frame of mind to be horrified or repelled by the mere taking of human life, for I had had a couple of years of sound military education and ample practice in killing. When heads were counted after an encounter with the enemy and we found that our comrades So-and-So had been killed, we were all of us sad for a while ; a week later we had for the most part happily forgotten. One seldom moralised in those days. It was simply a question of getting on with the war, and killing was a part of the day's work. But when I was calmly ordered to parade in full marching order for the purpose of rehearsing the little piece of drill and ceremonial that are deemed necessary to the execution in all military politeness and impressiveness of a man whom I had known, and with whom I had lived and laughed, even my thick soldier's skin and war-dulled wits could not resist the sinister mental and moral shock. It is one thing to consider capital punishment in the abstract ; it is another to take an active part in an execution. I may say that I escaped the horrid task by having an attack of malaria. *Most* supporters of the death penalty would find excuses if they were asked to execute a man or woman, which indicates an uneasy conscience regarding the act.

I quite saw the reason for that military execution, even then ; and I could have justified it to myself up to the hilt. If you must have war—the wholesale slaughter of fellow creatures—you must be prepared to inflict capital punishment upon those of your side who do not show a brave face to the enemy. The soldier must be made to realise that, whereas he has a sporting chance of coming alive out of a battle, he will certainly be put to death by his own side if he runs away or otherwise behaves in a cowardly manner. He must be offered bribes for bravery and must be made to suffer ignominy for cowardice. This is almost a universal rule of war ; there seems to be no possibility of moral compromise in it, nor any logical escape from it. And yet, knowing all this, I was glad of any excuse to avoid a loathsome duty on behalf of the herd to which I belonged.

So much for the military aspect of capital punishment. It can in a sense be justified, once the necessity for war is admitted. But is a modern state ever justified in inflicting the death penalty upon murderers ? In the first place it must be realised by everyone who has thought at all about the subject that the death penalty is always inflicted because of fear and hate : fear lest the murderer or his example become a public danger, and hatred (explicit or implicit) of him because of his crime. The State responds to a widespread desire amongst human beings for revenge by executing murderers ; the public servant, be he hangman or electrician, takes the place of the private citizen in a blood-feud. This action of the State is founded upon a

low estimate of human nature, which is unfortunately not always wrong, and it is the only sound argument I know in favour of capital punishment. It by no means aims at the achievement of a high standard of morality, indeed its aim is so low that no modern state now puts it forward in these terms; instead, it is called an expression of the "righteous" indignation of the community.

In those parts of the world where murderers are still executed, the general arguments used in favour of so doing may be summarised as follows: Capital punishment has a deterrent effect and if abolished homicidal crime would increase; it prevents mob-justice and lynchings; it is an economical way of ridding the world of undesirables; it is more humane than life imprisonment; and it appeases the feelings of the victim's relations. Of all these arguments the first is considered to be the chief, namely, the deterrent effect of executions, coupled with the speculation that in their absence murders tend to or would tend to increase. It is on an acceptance of the validity of this argument that all States rely which retain capital punishment. We must therefore look carefully at it, for if it can be proved to be unsound, the other arguments appear to be mere quibbles and trivialities, including that which refers to mob-justice, to which I shall refer later.

If the argument be correct that, by hanging murderers, large numbers of people are deterred from committing murder, it follows that if you abolish hanging there will be an increase in the number of murders. A murders B. Execute A and *ergo* C, D, E, etc., will refrain from committing the murders which they would commit if A is not hanged, guillotined or electrocuted! Does this actually happen? If so, capital punishment can be justified in the interests of public safety.

Fortunately it is possible to examine what has actually happened in a number of countries which formerly had the death penalty, but where it has been abolished by law, or has fallen into abeyance. Capital punishment has been legally abolished or completely abrogated by disuse in eleven European countries, in nine Latin-American Republics, in Queensland, and in eight States of the American Union. It is largely as a result of the experience of these countries that the new Draft Federal Code of Switzerland now omits it, and it explains why it is that in Germany the Judicial Committee of the Reichstag which is revising the Criminal Code has provisionally decided upon complete abolition. For if one views broadly all those countries where the penalty of death has been abolished, one finds that *there is no increase in the homicidal rates: indeed the evidence often shows a steady decrease in the number of murders*. According to Herr Woxen, Chief of the Prison Administration, a steady decrease in murder followed abolition in Norway; in Sweden also, according to Herr Almquist, who holds a similar position. In Italy during forty years of abolition there was a steady decrease in homicidal crime; Signor Mussolini's panicky reintroduction of the death penalty, for certain political assassinations, cannot obscure this important and unchallengeable fact, which all may read in the official crime statistics. If murders decreased under abolition in Italy, then for Mussolini to reintroduce the death penalty does not for a moment prove that abolition was a

failure, as some queer reasoners would have us believe ! In Switzerland there are cantons which retain capital punishment and others which do without it. In the abolitionist cantons the homicidal rate is 20.15 per 100,000 of population ; in those retaining the death penalty the rate is 20.17. Switzerland is perhaps the best existing example of the working of the death penalty in close proximity with its abolition, and here the evidence is slightly in favour of the abolitionist cantons. The United States of America show an astounding state of affairs. Where the death penalty is retained, we find the highest homicidal rate ; and in Maine, where it has been abolished since 1887, there are fewest deaths by violence. These facts are authentic, and may be verified by whoever takes the trouble to do so. In the abolitionist countries which I have not specifically mentioned above, there has been little or no difference in the homicidal rates since capital punishment ceased from being inflicted on murderers. We frequently hear people saying that capital punishment has had to be reintroduced in a country after it was found that abolition had failed. I defy anybody to prove this statement, and to name the country to which it applies. It is simply not true.

But the greatest fact of all in regard to the so-called deterrent effect of capital punishment is that it does not deter murderers from committing their crimes ; every part of the world where capital punishment exists, has its murderers. A is hanged in London to-day, and to-morrow B in Birmingham or Glasgow, perhaps after reading of the execution of A, proceeds to murder somebody. This fact is the most damning condemnation of the whole attitude of those who support the death penalty. *All* murderers *hope* to escape the death penalty. How then are they deterred by it ? I have never yet heard a satisfactory answer to this simple question.

It usually comes as a surprise to those who have not given this question of capital punishment serious study, to learn that there is a definite tendency for murderers to decrease in abolitionist countries. After all, this can be shown to be quite in accordance with our experience of human nature. With the abolition of the death penalty, and the substitution for it of a long term of imprisonment, there is removed one of the chief causes for verdicts of *Not Guilty* in murder trials. Juries consist of average men and women, and average men and women do not very much care to have the even tenor of their lives disturbed by the feelings that they have been responsible for sending a man or woman to the electric chair or gallows. It therefore often happens that unless a case is proved to the very hilt and there is no conceivable doubt regarding the guilt of the accused or no extenuating circumstances, they will pronounce a verdict of *Not Guilty*. Hence, there are acquittals which ought not to be acquittals, and murderers frequently go scot-free who deserve to be punished. On the other hand, where the penalty of death does not exist, and the accused will merely be locked up, an average jury is far more ready to say *Guilty*. In an age of humanitarianism, hypocrisy and compromise, this is to be expected. The net result is more convictions, the growth of confidence

amongst police, more certainty in the tracking down of malefactors, less graft, and a general speeding-up in the administration of justice. The nauseating publicity which attends certain murder trials is eliminated, because a trial is no longer a fight for life, a gladiatorial show for slick lawyer performers and criminals elevated to the status of public heroes. Instead, it becomes in the course of time a quiet, efficient affair, in which passions and prejudices are severely curbed. Criminals begin to realise that their chances of entirely escaping the net of justice are less. Hence we find fewer murders. The final result is beneficial to the public, in the sense that murders decrease, life and property become safer for law-abiding citizens, and the vile spirit of the blood feud is eliminated.

Nor is this all. The possibility of mistake is ever present, even in the most efficient of human institutions. Far more mistakes are made by courts, prisons, and executioners than the public ever realises. When a murderer has been executed and buried, he is forgotten: his friends nearly always try to forget. If he is wrongfully sentenced, it is well nigh impossible to prove that a mistake has been made. Nevertheless, it sometimes happens that by accident, or by virtue of long agitation or investigation, a mistake of justice is discovered and proved. Every country provides instances of this; even England, which considers herself to be a model of legal efficiency and despatch, recently received a severe shock to her complacency. Oscar Slater, sentenced to death, was reprieved by a tender-hearted Home Secretary, and served eighteen years penal servitude before evidence could be produced to prove his innocence. Now a broken man, the best years of life passed in a state of mental agony under a wrongful punishment, he has been released and given a state pension "as compensation". No man can give him back those eighteen lost years; but if he had been executed, as almost happened, what then? A worse case than this is reported from Germany, where a ghastly mistake was made only about three years ago, and recently discovered. A man named Jakobowski was executed on a charge of having murdered his four-year-old son. He had had a careful trial. In Germany the machinery of the law is notoriously painstaking, and great latitude is given to those accused of capital crimes, with regard to the submission of evidence in their favour. The rules of circumstantial evidence are severe, and this form of evidence is given closer scrutiny than elsewhere. Now three persons have confessed that they gave false evidence which decided Jakobowski's fate. Investigations have shown with a degree of likelihood amounting to certainty that the decapitated man could not possibly have committed the crime. Evidence was given before a Royal Commission on capital punishment in England that in the course of forty years, there were 22 persons sentenced to death who were afterwards proved to have been innocent of the crime for which they were sentenced: about one out of every 25 death sentences were pronounced upon men afterwards proved innocent.

Earlier in this article I have referred to mob-justice, which, it is claimed, is likely to follow upon the abolition of the death penalty. Unfortunately for those who advance this argument, there is no record

of such a thing ever having occurred. It is perhaps strange that those States in the American Union which show the greatest number of lynchings are States which retain the death penalty.

I shall conclude by stating my final objections to the death penalty: Capital punishment is an *advertisement for killing*, and it inflicts far greater punishment upon those who do not actually suffer it than upon those who do. It is a perpetration of a vile morality, which must be eradicated if the world is ever to be a better place than it is.

CHARLES DUFF.

II. THEOSOPHY AND CAPITAL PUNISHMENT.

[W. Q. Judge contributed the following article in *The Path* for September 1895. It explains the occult doctrine as to why capital punishment is bad both for him who forfeits the life of the body and also for all those who survive him.—EDS.]

From ignorance of the truth about man's real nature and faculties and their action and condition after bodily death, a number of evils flow. The effect of such want of knowledge is much wider than the concerns of one or several persons. Government and the administration of human justice under man-made laws will improve in proportion as there exists a greater amount of information on this all-important subject. When a wide and deep knowledge and belief in respect to the occult side of nature and of man shall have become the property of the people then may we expect a great change in the matter of capital punishment.

The killing of a human being by the authority of the state is morally wrong and also an injury to all the people; no criminal should be executed no matter what the offence. If the administration of the law is so faulty as to permit the release of the hardened criminal before the term of his sentence has expired, that has nothing to do with the question of killing him.

Under Christianity this killing is contrary to the law supposed to have emanated from the Supreme Law-giver. The commandment is: "Thou shalt not kill!" No exception is made for states or governments; it does not even except the animal kingdom. Under this law, therefore, it is not right to kill a dog, to say nothing of human beings. But the commandment has always been and still is ignored. The Theology of man is always able to argue away any regulation whatever; and the Christian nations once rioted in executions. At one time for stealing a loaf of bread or a few nails a man might be hanged. This, however, has been so altered that death at the hands of the law is imposed for murder only,—omitting some unimportant exceptions.

We can safely divide the criminals who have been or will be killed under our laws into two classes, *i.e.*, those persons who are hardened, vicious, murderous in nature; and those who are not so, but who, in a moment of passion, fear, or anger, have slain another.

The last may be again divided into those who are sorry for what they did, and those who are not. But even though those of the second class are not by intention enemies of Society, as are the others, they too before their execution may have their anger, resentment, desire for revenge and other feelings besides remorse, all aroused against Society which persecutes them and against those who directly take part in their trial and execution. The nature, passions, state of mind and bitterness of the criminal have, hence, to be taken into account in considering the question. For the condition which he is in when cut off from mundane life has much to do with the whole subject.

All the modes of execution are violent, whether by the knife, the sword, the bullet, by poison, rope, or electricity. And for the Theosophist the term *violent* as applied to death must mean more than it does to those who do not hold Theosophical views. For the latter, a violent death is distinguished from an easy natural one solely by the violence used against the victim. But for us such a death is the violent separation of the man from his body, and is a serious matter, of interest to the whole state. It creates in fact a paradox, for such persons are not dead; they remain with us as unseen criminals, able to do harm to the living and to cause damage to the whole of Society.

What happens? All the onlooker sees is that the sudden cutting off is accomplished; but what of the reality? A natural death is like the falling of a leaf near the winter time. The time is fully ripe, all the powers of the leaf having separated; those acting no longer, its stem has but a slight hold on the branch and the slightest wind takes it away. So with us; we begin to separate our different inner powers and parts one from the other because their full term has ended, and when the final tremor comes the various inner component parts of the man fall away from each other and let the soul go free. But the poor criminal has not come to the natural end of his life. His astral body is not ready to separate from his physical body, nor is the vital, nervous energy ready to leave. The entire inner man is closely knit together, and he is the reality. I have said these parts are not ready to separate—they are in fact not able to separate because they are bound together by law and a force over which only great Nature has control.

When then the mere physical body is so treated that a sudden, premature separation from the real man is effected, he is merely dazed for a time, after which he wakes up in the atmosphere of the earth, fully a sentient living being save for the body. He sees the people, he sees and feels again the pursuit of him by the law. His passions are alive. He has become a raging fire, a mass of hate; the victim of his fellows and of his own crime. Few of us are able, even under favourable circumstances, to admit ourselves as wholly wrong and to say that punishment inflicted on us by man is right and just, and the criminal has only hate and desire for revenge.

If now we remember that his state of mind was made worse by his trial and execution, we can see that he has become a menace to the living. Even if he be not so bad and full of revenge as said,

he is himself the repository of his own deeds ; he carries with him into the astral realm surrounding us the pictures of his crimes, and these are ever living creatures, as it were. In any case he is dangerous. Floating as he does in the very realm in which our mind and senses operate, he is for ever coming in contact with the mind and senses of the living. More people than we suspect are nervous and sensitive. If these sensitives are touched by this invisible criminal they have injected into them at once the pictures of his crime and punishment, the vibrations from his hate, malice and revenge. Like creates like, and thus these vibrations create their like. Many a person has been impelled by some unknown force to commit crime ; and that force came from such an inhabitant of our sphere.

And even with those not called " sensitive " these floating criminals have an effect, arousing evil thoughts where any basis for such exist in those individuals. We cannot argue away the immense force of hate, revenge, fear, vanity, all combined. Take the case of Guiteau who shot President Garfield. He went through many days of trial. His hate, anger, and vanity were aroused to the highest pitch everyday and until the last, and he died full of curses for every one who had anything to do with his troubles. Can we be so foolish as to say that all the force he thus generated was at once dissipated ? Of course it was not. In time it will be transformed into other forces, but during the long time before that takes place the living Guiteau will float through our mind and senses carrying with him and dragging over us the awful pictures drawn and frightful passions engendered.

The Theosophist who believes in the multiple nature of man and in the complexity of his inner nature, and knows that that is governed by law and not by mere chance or by the fancy of those who prate of the need for protecting society when they do not know the right way to do it, relying only on the punitive and retaliatory Mosaic law—will oppose capital punishment. He sees it is unjust to the living, a danger to the state, and that it allows no chance whatever for any reformation of the criminal.

WILLIAM Q. JUDGE.

HISTORICITY OF THE KING-LISTS OF THE PURANAS.

[**Dr. L. A. Waddell**, LL.D., C.B., C.I.E., spent about a quarter of a century in India exploring, in the intervals of his official duties, the ethnology and archæology of the land. He visited and camped amongst most of the oldest traditional sites and "dead cities" and discovered several lost sites, some of which he partially excavated, revealing monuments and inscriptions. He is the author, amongst other works, of *Discovery of the Last Palibotra (Pataliputra) of the Greeks*, *The Buddhism of Tibet, Lhasa and its Mysteries*, *The Aryan Origin of the Alphabet*, *A Sumer-Aryan Dictionary*, *The Makers of Civilization in Race and History*.

This short article reiterates the somewhat quaint theory, which, in his last named volume, Dr. Waddell advances, and with which practically no one seems to agree.

One good result of Dr. Waddell's book and this article is the deserved importance the Puranas obtain as historical and chronological volumes; apropos of which we may be permitted to quote something from *Isis Unveiled* published in 1877:—"At the time that the high-priest Hilkiah is said to have found the *Book of the Law*, the Hindu Puranas were known to the Assyrians. These last had for many centuries held dominion from the Hellespont to the Indus, and probably crowded the Aryans out of Bactriana into the Punjab. The *Book of the Law* seems to have been a Purana." (II. P. 492).

We draw our readers' attention to the Note appended to this article.—Eds.]

Hitherto, the King-Lists and Chronicles of the Early Aryans, which form about one-fourth of the bulk of the large body of popular versified Ancient Indian scriptures on the creation of the universe, cosmogony, the genealogy of the gods, later pantheistic dogmatic theology, political ordinances and legends, styled collectively "The Puranas" or "The Ancient Tradition," have been rejected by all European Vedic Sanscrit scholars and stigmatised by them as fabulous and non-historical.

That opinion, however, is now seen to rest merely on the unfounded assumption of these Vedic scholars, obsessed with the notion that the Vedic Hymns or Psalms are the sole repository of all knowledge of the Early Aryans, that any other traditional ancient Aryan kings not mentioned in the Vedas are necessarily fabulous; especially so, as no one has been able to find any traces of those Early Puranic Kings in India. This latter argument, they do not appear to have noticed, would be equally destructive of the historicity of the Vedic Kings, all of whom they place within the confines of India, yet of whom not a single inscriptional or local traditional trace has ever been found in India proper, i.e., Gangetic India and the Punjab (wherein they place the composition of the Vedas), along with Rajputana, Bombay and the Dekhan. In their notions of the historicity of the Vedas and the non-historicity of the Purana King-Lists they are oblivious to the patent fact that the purpose of the Vedic Hymns is

purely liturgical and non-historic, whilst the purpose of the Puranic King-Lists and Chronicles is essentially epic and historical ; so that one could no more expect to find complete lists of the Early Aryan kings and patriarchs in the Vedic Hymns than one could expect to find complete lists of the Jewish kings and patriarchs in the Psalms, most of which were admittedly composed long after David.

In my explorations for the origin of the Indo-Aryans, I found no trace whatever of any ancient civilisation in the Gangetic Valley and Punjab which can be dated earlier than about the seventh century B.C., and no inscriptions earlier than of the fourth century B.C. However, civilisation seems suddenly to appear there in its fully fledged Indo-Aryan form with the Vedas in the seventh century B.C. Now, the topography of the Vedas differed markedly from the Indian topography (with the exception of the Indus Valley) so it became evident that the Indo-Aryans had suddenly arrived in Gangetic India about the beginning of the seventh century B.C. Searching for their pre-Indian homeland, I was led by the clues of their ready-made "Indo-Aryan" civilisation with its social and political constitutions, laws, religion and literature to Mesopotamia and Asia Minor of the Hittites, with correspondingly advanced civilisation, substantially identical in its details.

Comparison of the Puranic King-Lists with those of the Sumerians, disclosed that the two King-Lists, Sumerian and Aryan Puranic, were substantially identical. This identity in both lists extended from the First King of the First Dynasty, Sumerian and Aryan, continuously downwards to the end of the Kassite Dynasty of the Sumerians in the later Babylonian period, that is, for over two thousand years—an overwhelming proof of identity unparalleled elsewhere in the annals of history. The identity rested not only in their names and titles, but also in their exact chronological position and order, and in the achievements of their leading Kings, Sumerian and Aryan Puranic. The identity also descended into the names of sons and queen consorts. Thus, for example, the names and titles of the five famous colonising sons of the great early Aryan Emperor Haryashwa, the Uruash of the Sumerians (who reigned c. 3100-3070 B.C.) are absolutely identical in both lists and in contemporary Sumerian monuments, as well as identical in their achievements. All this, added to the demonstrated radical identity of the Sumerian language with the Aryan, and the Aryan physical type of the Sumerians, conclusively proved that the Sumerians were the Early Aryans, and that the early homeland of the Sumerians in Asia Minor was the pre-Indian homeland of the Indo-Aryans.

Moreover, I observed that the last king of the Hittites or Khatti, the imperial Asia Minor sept of the Sumerians, namely "Wisiti-the-Hero," who was slain and whose people were driven out of their old Hittite homeland by the savage exterminating Assyrian King Sargon II in 717 B.C., was identical with King Vicitra-Vira or "Vicitra-the-Hero" of the Puranic list and chronicles. This latter king was the father of the first semi-historical king of Gangetic India, Dhrita

Rashtra, leader of the exodus of the eastern branch of the Aryans, *via* Persia to India from Syria, Asia Minor, and in India contemporaneous with the great war of the Bharats waged for the partition of India.

It was found that in the enforced exodus or flight of the remnants of the Hittites or Khatti sept of the Sumerians to India, they had carried off with them from their central archives their cherished ancestral King-Lists and Chronicles, as their most precious heritage, and embedded them bodily with scrupulous care in the Puranas at the beginning of the seventh century B.C. There they have lain until now when they are proved to be truly historical.

L. A. WADDELL.

A NOTE ON THE ABOVE.

[D. G. Vinod, M.A., is a keen student of Higher Logic and Comparative Philosophy. Articles from his pen have appeared in several periodicals, and he has written the following critical Note on Dr. Waddell's article, which our readers will find interesting.—Eds.]

With regard to Dr. Waddell's article there are three suggestions to offer. The first is that a mere comparison, such as Dr. Waddell draws, however elaborate, is as useful, in point of evidence, to his opponents as it is to himself. Just because two things are similar, we cannot say, except arbitrarily, that one is the origin of the other. Suppose we should suggest that the Puranic King-list is prior to the Sumerian, and is also the source of the latter, we should have all the evidence of Dr. Waddell in our favour. And this supposition has, in fact, a valid basis. The Aryan character of the Sumerian language is not accepted by authorities such as T. Kluge (1921). They do not take it to be either Indo-European or Semitic, but assign to it the stage of development to which the African languages had reached. Others, again, find Caucasian and Dravidian similarities. The Sanskrit language is Aryan to the core and the Sumerian King-list with its Aryan character must have had its origin in the Puranic King-list.

Secondly, the calendars of the Aryan races appear to have been derived from the Arctic year, which consists of a six months' day and a six months' night. If the Aryan yearly calendars are really so derived, Dr. Waddell's thesis of the Sumerian Home would be replaced by that of the Arctic Home. Evidence of comparative philology is in full support of the view that the Aryan calendars do show traces of the Arctic influence. It is pertinent to quote Dr. Schrader in this connection :

Nearly everywhere in the chronology of the individual peoples a division of the year into two parts can be traced. This finds linguistic expression in the circumstance that the terms for summer, spring and winter have parallel suffix formations. As in the primeval period *jhim* and *sem* existed side by side, so in Zend *zima* and *hama* correspond to each other; in Armenian *amarn* and *jmern*; in Teutonic *sum-ar* and *wint-ar*; in Celtic *gam* and *sam*; in India *vasanta* and *hemanta*. There is absolutely no instance in which one and the same language

shows identity of suffixes in the names of the *three* seasons of the year. In Slavonic, also, the year is divided into two principal divisions, summer (*lêto*) and winter (*zima*); and finally evident traces of old state of things are not wanting in Greek and Latin.

In setting forth his thesis Dr. Waddell has not sufficiently considered such possible opposition from different quarters. This problem of calendars would, we fear, make it necessary for Dr. Waddell to revise his views. Another instance of the limited character of his research is the possible opposition to his views because of the recent findings at Harappa and Mohenjo Daro.

Thirdly, a study of the following Rig Vedic hymns—vii, 76, 3; i, 123, 8; iv. 51, 7-9—also a few passages in the Taittirīya Samhitā and Brāhmaṇa prove for the writer the polar character of the Vedic Dawn. The description which Dr. Warren gives of the Polar Dawn is identical with the description of the dawn as given in the Vedas; and the passage in the Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa about the year-long day of the Gods suggest that the Aryans to begin with may have had their home at the North Pole. Does this account for the difference between the topography of the Vedas and the Indian topography of which Dr. Waddell speaks?

D. G. VINOD.

We are assured by the Orientalists that chronology is both hopelessly mixed and absurdly exaggerated in the Puranas and other Hindu Scriptures. We feel quite prepared to agree with the accusation. Yet, if Aryan writers did allow their chronological pendulum to swing too far one way occasionally, beyond the legitimate limit of fact; nevertheless, when the distance of that deviation is compared with the distance of the Orientalists' deviation in the opposite direction, moderation will be found on the Brahminical side. It is the Pundit who will in the long run be found more truthful and nearer to fact than the Sanskritist.... As for the Western Orientalist, he must be excused, on account of his undeniable ignorance of the methods used by archaic Esotericism.

H. P. BLAVATSKY—*Secret Doctrine II.* 225.

THE SCIENCE (?) OF GOVERNMENT.

[J. R. Stratford said to us that he was putting his "real efforts on what seems to me the astounding curiosities of political, religious and philosophical forms. The worshipped 99% in all of them seem to me twaddle." He concluded : "If you believe as I do in tearing to pieces all the lies which have been agreed upon, I'd like to hear from you." He did, and responded with the following article ; his hope has been that somebody will print "something that won't be mere 'Lilies of the Valley'." THE ARYAN PATH has among its aims the design to "bring to light the hidden things of darkness". We had some hopes of not only a virile but a thoughtfully constructive exposure of high misdemeanour. Mr. Stratford would naturally prefer that we let him have his say in his own style. Our readers will find much good under the brusque exterior of the article.—Eds.]

In the alleged science of human government the learned doctors have everywhere created structures of law so vast that the mere expense of government has become a burden and a heavy one for the peoples supporting them. More, laws everywhere have become so numerous conflicting that the doctors themselves are in perpetual wrangle as to what is law and what is not.

Science ? There is no such thing as a science of government nor ever has there been any.

Any investigator worthy the name of scientist goes about his business without prejudice and above all with perfect confidence in the integrity of everything in Creation in so far as that integrity means anything to what he has in hand. Such men never create laws. They merely discover them. Laws worth the name are facts.

A professor of mathematics who would offer rules for arithmetic which would now and then give five or a dozen or nothing as the sum of two and two would be laughed at for a jackass and properly hooted out of any further hearing.

From time immemorial the professors of the science of government have been doing little better than that, and doing no better yet for they still follow the same technique.

We will discuss their technique in a minute.

Their works are the first thing to be discussed.

The alleged object of their works is social order, *i.e.*, orderly society. Never have they yet devised a system which didn't result sooner or later in either an ever-diminishing number of well-to-do people or an ever-increasing number of the poor among whom the crimes of arrogance and of envy work like leavens. Then every so often when these leavens have done their work in these and those nationalistic lumps of the facial dough, there have been wars to kill and maim a lot of men, destroy a lot of property, fill everybody involved with hate.

Such work is no good.

But these doctors always have an alibi. They blame all the failures of government on Human Nature.

Twaddle.

There is no reason whatever for believing that since Man is by long odds the highest work in Creation as evidenced by his own works outside of his efforts at government, there was anything left out in his make up which should perennially debase individuals by the millions and sporadically bring the millions to the stupidity of mortal combat.

To call such stuff Human Nature is simply to lie.

That isn't even brute nature. The brutes do better unless mindless two-legged brutes harry them into it. Some of the brutes kill for food. Why not? So do we. But no brute kills of his own kind for food nor do we. But we kill of our own kind daily everywhere without any such primarily just reason.

We kill for property, for this, that and the other, and in the name of government, because from time immemorial our learned doctors in the science of government have always insisted and still insist that while Man is the noblest work of God there is something so radically wrong with him that he is after all no good, which is the same as to say that while God knew his onions at everything else he was a plain dub in the matter of Man after all.

There was a time no doubt when the science of all common things was in this same shamanistic medicine man stage in which the science of human government still potters.

They used to believe in the power of charms, incantations, strings of words in order to make mere matter perform what were called miracles.

By dealing with common everyday facts in a plain everyday honest fashion the men who deserve to be called scientists now take a little of this and of that and the other dust of the earth and fashion these dusts into contrivances whereby men soar in the air, convey their messages in a minute to the other side of the earth, or again ease, even end, most of the burdens of the body.

Would any such achievement ever have been, had the investigators gone at their problems with the tight lipped conviction that the particular material they had to work with was rotten to the core, a mass of contradictions and as unstable and dangerous to work with as dynamite?

We know that they wouldn't have done a thing. We know that for long periods of time the proper attitude of people was exactly that way toward what everyone now knows are the common everyday laws of matter.

Everything in that firle was a dark mystery, taboo. Everything that a horse, an ox, a dog or a chicken couldn't understand belonged to the Devil. If a man attempted to learn more than his dog knew he deserved to be burnt. Sometimes he was burnt.

Jesus Christ came into the earth with nothing more than a brief for Human Nature. He told them that there wasn't any doubt whatever about the integrity of mankind; that every last one of the race were fit for the Kingdom of Heaven if they only knew it. Everybody who wasn't going to lose something by it believed what he said, knew it was so. Others crucified him for what they believed was probably impiety; again there is no doubt but that those in authority killed him to save their jobs and imaginary dignities.

He was the boldest exponent of the principles of human government that ever lived, bar none.

And he was bold for this reason. He declared that every man was innately worthy.

That was contrary to all the dicta of the wise men in matters of government and religion, and still is contrary to their dicta, no matter what they profess. The proof of the pudding is in chewing the bag.

Instead of paying strict attention to his teachings his hopeful followers have been content to make an incantation out of his name. Maybe it will work yet. But the real thing he offered has never been tried.

However this little discussion has nothing to do with that, beyond the mere statement that the true principles of human government, *i.e.*, the science of it, was laid down by Jesus Christ.

That such a science will some day be a fact instead of the mere prayerful of the billion odd people in this earth most of whom it is hardly to be doubted would go cheerfully to the Cross for its consummation, no really thoughtful person can greatly doubt.

Science of Government.

Government is still in the hands of medicine men, shamans, fakirs.

But not for one minute are those men and their works living or dead to be despised.

We are greatly ignorant in this matter.

The imagined experience of the race, long as the records run, seems to bear out these men and all they have done.

But in the light of every day common knowledge in all other fields of human knowledge we all begin to see that they have been wrong. They do too. But bound by what seems to them the only safe precedent they beat the same old unsatisfactory paths which lead to the same old disappointments and the same old tragedies.

Political systems are the only means to government so far devised.

What are political systems?

The earlier forms got their authority simply by force and held it that way. That's just brute authority. It has often been benign. Most of the brutes are benign anyhow. But that kind of authority won't work for Man. He is too high for it. Time has shown

that clearly enough. So now the way to Government authority is through some form of political hocus-pocus whereby everybody hopes to attain his ideal by compromising his ideal.

What a marvel of clear thought and clear thinking !

We will get what we believe in, by none of us believing or firmly insisting on anything unless it suits everybody else or a majority.

These are remarkable formulæ.

So we have the spectacle of say Prohibition in the United States, wheat growing in Russia, dictators here and there over highly cultured peoples, Gandhi an anarchist under one of the very fairest of governments because he picks up a handful of free salt on the sea shore. And but lately eight millions of dead men in Flanders and elsewhere on the battlefields throughout the earth.

Science of government ?

Not yet and not by a long way.

Two and two make four in anything else but in government.

In government to date they may make nothing or anything but four.

J. R. STRATFORD.

In the prognostication of *such* future events, at any rate, all foretold on the authority of cyclic recurrences, there is no psychic phenomenon involved. It is neither *prevision*, nor *prophecy* ; no more than is the signalling of a comet or star, several years before its appearance. It is simply knowledge and mathematically correct computations which enable the WISE MEN OF THE EAST to foretell, for instance, that England is on the eve of such or another catastrophe ; France, nearing such a point of her cycle, and Europe in general threatened with, or rather, on the eve of, a cataclysm, which her own cycle of racial *Karma* has led her to. The reliability of the information depends, of course, on the acceptation or rejection of the claim for a tremendous period of historical observation. Eastern Initiates maintain that they have preserved records of the racial development and of events of universal import ever since the beginning of the Fourth Race—that which preceded being traditional.

H. P. BLAVATSKY—*Secret Doctrine*, I. 646.

FROM PARIS.

[**Mlle. M. Dugard's** letters and articles have drawn deserved praise from several regular readers of **THE ARYAN PATH**.—EDS.]

Humanism is everywhere the order of the day. How could it be otherwise? The true duty of each generation towards its youth is not to transmit the maximum of knowledge that has been attained, but to furnish a discipline which enables that youth to reach the stature of "a noble and beautiful type of man." What is termed "Humanism" aims at this ideal type, and to provide as far as possible such discipline; but in our changing times this is necessarily subject to alteration.

In the sixteenth century, fascinated by the Renaissance, Occidental Europe relegated Christian culture to the background, and laid down as a principle that, to lead its youth to ideal manhood, there was no better way than to make it thoroughly familiar with Roman and Greek culture. So the expression, "the humanities," meant the study of Latin and Greek authors in the original. For three hundred years this principle had the value of an article of faith. But during the nineteenth century, the development of natural history, chemistry, physics, mechanics, and the increasing intercourse with foreigners, brought people to feel that Humanism ought to have a broader foundation than Greek and Latin letters—which were often taught in a formal spirit. Then, sciences and modern languages were penetrating largely into secondary education, and some people began to attribute to them as great an educative power as that of Latin and Greek culture. The social overthrow caused by the War, the priority given to economic factors and the progress of international relations, have strengthened the movement on behalf of "Modern Humanities"—that is, humanities based on sciences and living languages. With the ancient humanities and their modern descendants based on sciences and modern languages—both of which, of course, are the heritage of the *élite*—is it not possible to conceive of "technical humanities" which should be accessible to the masses? In addition, is it right to exclude from our idea of humanism the Christian and Hebrew factors—or factors drawn from the Orient?

People interested in these questions (most important for the formation of the mind of the morrow), may consult with profit *For A New Humanism* (Documents of Faith and Life)—inquiries made by M. Arbousse Bastide among professors, philosophers, writers, etc. They will find there set forth and justified the reasons which call for a revival of humanism.

This survey is the more opportune because the unquiet youth of the after-war does not cease to be a somewhat disquieting youth. This is not, however, the feeling of M. Roland Alix who, a young man

himself, has just given us in *The New Youth* the synthesis and commentary of the answers of many students interrogated on their works, their tastes, and their pastimes, etc. From it he draws an optimistic picture of the youth of to-day, as opposed to the youth of yesterday,—ideologists and dreamers, careless and passive, too easily resigned to a poor or mediocre existence. According to him, the young men of 1930 distinguish themselves by their energy, their realism, a sense of life which enables them to adapt their personality to a world where Intelligence and Boldness have even more value than Force. They are workers, creators, and subordinate everything to productive activity. They do not care for studies, and though they take diplomas, it is not for the sake of knowledge itself, but for the chances of success that knowledge alone can offer. They do not care for politics, because political discussions are fruitless. They hold fast to Justice and Order, because in iniquity and anarchy no work is possible. They may be linked to a church and “practise” religion; but it is often less for religion itself than for the social organization that the church affords, and the guidance that it offers. They like sport, art and literature; but for them, these are only amusements, a means of relaxation, to return more disposed to their business.

That such a type of young man is largely prevalent in France and in all occidental Europe, everybody knows. But as the author suggests, to “felicitate ourselves on this new spirit,” we absolutely refuse. To ignore the beneficent efforts of the elders, to show them a kind but pitying scorn, to be unable to take interest in science, in poetry, in human problems, to call oneself sincere and cling to a church for reasons quite unconnected with its profound doctrine, all these things do not constitute superiority. If, at least, this type of young man loved his work, we could forgive him much. But it is not so. This work, to which he sacrifices all the intellectual and moral values, has no interest for him. “What he wants is a means of living. How, it does not matter. The work in itself is rather a matter of indifference.” He means to get money; that is the single aim of his activity. The young man has no real taste for effort; but he does not despise it. By it “one succeeds promptly”—that is all that he has understood. In his mind disinterestedness exists no longer, and a man is judged by his activity, which is measured by cash.

When we read these sentiments, we ask ourselves how it is possible to conclude by praising the young man of 1930 who “puts an end to egoisms,” “ascends to healthier mental regions,” and will be probably “our salvation.” “The young men of to-day will make the great Peace.”

Is M. Alix ignorant of the fact that the love of pleasure and power deriving from money is one of the strongest factors of war? Happily, near these young men who dream only of bank notes and proclaim it aloud, there are others who work silently in a spirit of disinterestedness and love for their neighbour. These are the sap of the world, and it is they who will make “the great Peace.”

M. DUGARD.

IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS.

HOME, THE NURSERY OF THE INFINITE.*

[**Patricia Edge** is a rising English journalist, particularly interested in the welfare of children.

She presents many Theosophical ideas in this review article. It is high time that the sanctity and the dignity of the home should gain recognition from serious-minded men and women; and journalists like Miss Edge may well be advised to study the ancient Aryan Codes such as *Manu Smriti* to see what can be accepted by the modern world, including the West, in order to build a society on sure foundations.—EDS.]

“No nation can be destroyed,” it has been said, “while it possesses a good home life.” Through all the past generations the biggest influence in home life has been woman. Writers on the subject insistently divide her into two classes: women at home and women at work. Why not bring both classes together and say rather “women at work through the medium of home”?

Dora Russell in *Hypatia* writes “The life of the working woman who intends maternity is becoming well-nigh impossible.” Yet maternity in itself is a very great work: the peopling of the world of the future is no small task. Healthy children, with good, flat backs and firm legs, active intelligences and vital, are an achievement. The woman who intends maternity should seek to fit herself and her mate for it. Much is written of the healthy, vigorous, slim, young girls of to-day—so they may be at eighteen and twenty after an out-of-door life, with plenty of exercise at school or college, but a few years at business, in a factory, in a shop, will soon lower their vitality and lessen their power of resistance. Women become such slaves to ideas: with the feminist movement came cries of “equality between the sexes—equal pay, equal work, freedom.” So the long days spent in the same room, tapping away the same letters, are to some the aim and achievement of their desires. Let women be taught that there is a bigger and finer field waiting for them to work on; let them as is suggested in *Hypatia* be taught “to teach and tend maternity and ensure rest for pregnant and nursing women, to see that houses and schools are built, and to control and purify the food-supply.” “Poor food,” Mrs. Russell says later, “and over-crowding are the ladder down

* *Hypatia* or Women and Knowledge, by Mrs. Bertrand Russell. *Lysistrata* or Woman's Future and Future Woman, by Anthony M. Ludovici. *Hymen* or the Future of Marriage, by Norman Haire. *Halcyon* or the Future of Monogamy, by Vera Brittain. *Thrasymachus* or the Future of Morals, by C. E. M. Joad. *Birth Control and the State*, by C. P. Blacker. *Romulus* or the Future of the Child, by Robert T. Lewis. *Lares et Penates* or The Home of the Future, by H. J. Birnsgtingl. (To-day and To-morrow Series. Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., Ltd., London. 2s. 6d. per volume).

which we go to mental deficiency and ultimate complete feebleness of mind." The degeneration in food and cooking are perhaps among the worst evils of our scientific age.

Indirectly, as is shown by Ludovici in *Lysistrata*, they lie at the foundation of our social system. Improper nourishment leads to improper bodily functioning, decaying teeth, poisoned blood, and ultimately a nation of physically unfit people. Overcrowded rooms—not necessarily, as is unhappily the case in slums, overcrowded with people, but rooms filled with unnecessary furniture and ugly ornaments—and bad ventilation, aggravate the ill-health caused by improper nourishment. "A nation ultimately becomes the image of its values," writes Ludovici. "The values are the die, the nation is the coin. From the face of the coin we judge the die." A nation of physically and mentally unfit will not have any place or achieve any good in the world. The future is ours and woman can help to make or mar it.

The first steps towards social reform should be a complete destruction of our body-despising values, and of the values which make it virtuous to sacrifice the greater for the less. One is reminded of Erewhon, the ideal state as visualised by Samuel Butler, where those who caught and spread diseases were penalised and imprisoned, whilst those who stole food for their bodily necessities were helped economically.

Dr. Haire is engrossed with one theme, mostly warped: "The primary object underlying marriage," he writes, "has always been, and still is, sexual union." Yet he deplores the frequency of unhappy marriages! Any two people who marry thus governed by desire inevitably find unhappiness as they discover that they are temperamentally unsuited and one perhaps far and away mentally the inferior. People with full mental lives would not be obsessed by sex in this way. Books about sex, plays about sex—if we had instead insistence on the ideal of purity and chastity a person about to marry would choose someone spiritually and mentally his or her affinity. People would forget the sex idea just as much as now they remember it. With infinite relief one turns from Dr. Haire to the doctrines of *Halcyon* which rightly state that marriages of any worth are based "upon the beauty which arises from intelligence and experience," a fine companionship and complete understanding, and in which children are not unfortunate occurrences but the result of a definite desire for them with the hope of giving to civilisation a healthy, whole-minded citizen. Following Ludovici, we are to make ourselves physically and mentally fit to bear children and we should also make ourselves temperamentally competent to educate and train them. Freedom of belief, action and desire should be a child's heritage, if his vitality is to express itself creatively.

Mass control, mass education, mass work, etc., which tends to the mechanising of its subjects, has led to our table of values so much deplored by Ludovici and to our illogical moral code so effectively pillorised by C. E. M. Joad in *Thrasymachus*—a code which imprisons for six months the man who steals a loaf for his starving wife, and

cautions or fines almost negligibly the father who ill-treats his child to such an extent that it might lead to life-long injury ; a code which makes it a punishable offence to steal certain birds' eggs and allows and promotes game shooting, and the blinding and caging of canaries. Thus, a sociable person with an affection for mankind must necessarily adopt its morals, however distasteful, or become an outcast. Independence, originality, the breaking of traditions, these always have raised controversy and their inspirers been ostracised or condemned. Yet through them have high ideals been established. Christ, Jeanne d'Arc, and in a lesser degree, Luther, Fox and Ibsen were all reformers who suffered for their creeds, but whose achievements last for all time. Good workmanship inspired by putting *our heart and soul into things*, however insignificant, is better than the most perfect craftsmanship which has no ideal or vitality to give it life force. Moreover, as people become more and more engrossed in those activities in which they have the greatest interest, they will seek less for superficial enjoyments. "Dissatisfaction with the elementary pleasures of life," writes Dr. C. P. Blacker, "the craving after artificial stimuli and new sensations, have always been, and probably will always remain, the surest way to decadence in a race, and as such should be combated." Combated through self-expression, and, following from it, through self-control. As Goethe points out, one is dependent on the other "for he who ne'er can rule himself, will be a slave for ever."

Working in direct opposition to self-control is the ever increasing practice of birth control. Superficially advocated as an economic necessity for the good of the State and the individual, it will inevitably have a terrible effect on the latter's self-esteem, and on the self-respect of the nation itself. The housewife who puts a clean cover over a table to hide the dirt is condemned as slovenly, yet we are ready to approve the State's covering up its deficiencies by giving them a pleasant exterior. We hear much eloquent talk of the poor woman who gives birth to an endless succession of children in the congested slum-house room, in which she works, sleeps and in which her children play. Dr. Blacker in *Birth Control and the State* alludes to her and, deploring the fact that her surroundings are not suitable for childbearing, concludes that therefore she must be shown the means to prevent it. Is the State, then, to spend its money in establishing birth control centres rather than in improving the conditions in which slum people live? Self-control cannot be taught to a drunken man, but his environment, work and education can be so altered that his sufficiently full and pleasant life leaves him no wish to numb his senses with drink. Give the working man better conditions of living and a wider education and, for his own newly-acquired self-respect, he will learn the beauty and strength of a self-controlled mind. "He that hath gained an entire conquest over himself will find no mighty difficulties to subdue all other opposition," said Thomas à Kempis.

The children themselves will benefit from such conditions. They will start life with the heritage of self-discipline, will be in more suitable surroundings, and will have parents who are more competent to train them. The children of Ludovici's future, in which people will have

learnt to realise their responsibilities, will find their schoolroom in the home and be given, only as a last resource, to strangers, the parents themselves making it their duty to fit themselves for this task. On the other hand, Dr. Haire, in his future, advocates the State support of children, the majority of parents, he says, being unfit to have any control over their children. It would surely be a saner and more practical remedy to educate parents to be able to fulfil their responsibilities than to treat them like mentally undeveloped children who cannot be expected to bear the consequences of their own actions. Amongst the poorer classes where the majority of mothers have to work away from home, the Nursery school will take the place of home education. It should not be a necessity amongst the middle and upper classes. Nursery schools, however competently managed must make the child, to a certain degree, a unit instead of an individual, and should only be used as a last resource. At present their existence is most necessary, for it will be some time before parents are sufficiently enlightened to understand their children. The most recurrent mistake in the parents' attitude to the child is in "negative" rule, as Robert Lewis says in *Romulus* training by "don'ts" instead of "do's". The child is much less preoccupied with worldly things than the adult. He is nearer a true understanding of nature and the Infinite. Give him free scope to indulge this, learn from him rather than try to inculcate in him the adult's more warped perceptions, and as he grows older he will still keep his lovely wisdom which gives him a true understanding of the Infinite and Immortal.

Home and home life ought to give him the right background. The modern house, however, is in most cases quite unsuitable. In his early years of life the child is gathering his first impressions of beauty—beauty of nature, sound, colour and form: but what place have these in most homes of to-day? H. J. Birnstingl, in *Lares et Penates*, draws a vivid word picture of our houses, with all their tawdriness, vulgarity and ugliness; their inadequacy of space, and their badly filled space; their lack of good books, pictures and artistic arrangements; and the excess of artificial, frippery ornamentation. The home of the future should not only be beautiful in form, well-proportioned and artistically decorated, but it should have rooms well-equipped for specified purposes. There should be a place where good food—not tinned, patented, or specially prepared foods which tend to impair physical strength and beauty—can be cooked, and the science of food learnt. When Self-expression is recognised as orthodox, people and children will think out for themselves their own religion, and there should be a place in every house where quiet study can be enjoyed and where fine, good books can be found. Here the child will be able to read, think, work out his own ideas and found a more lasting faith than any in which he is forced to believe. It has been said that the "Home is the Nursery of the Infinite," and it should be the responsibility of the community to make of this truism not a written statement but a positive fact and establishment.

PATRICIA EDGE.

SOME BUDDHIST LITERATURE.*

Of all religions, Buddhism is most free from degrading corruptions. This is not to say that it radiates the pristine purity of the teachings of the Enlightened One; but only that priestcraft found no strong lever to work upon in the code of ethics the Buddha taught, and therefore the religion has remained remarkably free of dogmatism. Theosophy encounters irritation and inimical feeling on the part of most religions whose orthodoxy it undermines; not so with Buddhism. Theosophy can welcome a Buddhistic renaissance as part and parcel of the work of the great Theosophical Movement, in the sure hope that such renaissance will not only maintain the breadth of its philosophic outlook and the practicality of its ethical propositions, but further enhance its worth by removing any tendency to orthodoxy. Such a tendency is common to human nature, and professing Buddhists can no more be free from it than men and women of other faiths. We say this because in this propaganda literature under review we see a sign here, and catch an expression there, which look like a manifestation, very likely unconscious, of the tendency to orthodoxy.

Thus Mr. Ellam tries to concretize Buddha's teachings into a new vehicle (we will not enter into a philological discussion with him on the accuracy of the title of his book) which in Christian phraseology might be described as the gospel according to J. E. Ellam. The work suffers from its author's prejudices against many systems of thought including Mahayana Buddhism; what is not acceptable to Mr. Ellam is not Buddhism. The book may proselytize a few into the Buddhistic creed; it has not the power to bring an inner conversion to a soul who seeks to break the fetters of creed and dogmas.

Leaflet No. 1 of the Christo-Buddhist Union, however, promises freedom and speak with virility and even vigour, but what it gains in width of outlook it loses in depth of perception. To certain students of Theosophy also this applies, and we cannot resist the temptation of quoting:—

People prattle about renouncing Nirvana, some day, for the good of the world when everyone is aware that they cannot renounce a mutton cutlet: about their intention of not practising the siddhis—which they have never possessed: about attaining Transcendental Consciousness when they cannot write a page of clear English: about Union with the Absolute, when they are not in union with a flea—if it bites them, they jump.

This Union of Non-Ritualists is unknown to us but we may venture a word of advice—they must look out lest they fall prey to psychism in personal as to anarchism in collective life.

* *Navayana* by J. E. Ellam. (Rider & Co., 3s. 6d.) *The Christo Buddhist, Friend*—Leaflet No. 1 (Christo-Buddhist Union of Non-Ritualists, Paris). *A Religion for Modern Youth* by Christmas Humphreys (Anglo-American Publications, London). *An Outline of Buddhism* by Shinkaku (Hongwanji Temple, Honolulu). *Buddhism Applied* (Buddhist Lodge, London). *Selected Buddhist Scriptures* (Buddhist Lodge, London). *Buddhism for the Young* by Princess Poon Diskul of Siam (Luzac & Co., 2s.)

Equally ignorant are we of the Anglo-American publications under whose auspices the next item of our series is published. It is a simple and wholesome presentation which will not only satisfy an enquirer but prompt him to look for more of this philosophy; therefore the pamphlet forms a good stepping-stone to that excellent volume—*The Creed of Buddha* by Edmond Holmes.

For the same purpose but very differently compiled is the next pamphlet by Shinkaku—Mr. Ernest Hunt of Honolulu who edits *The Dobo* and who is zealous from all appearances of fashioning a Buddhist church after the Christian pattern, with priests and bishops.

The next two are publications of the Buddhist Lodge of London; they start a series of pamphlets. While we have no quarrel whatever with the contents of the first, those of the second gave us such a thrill that we said to ourselves—why did it not strike the good friends to confine their series to translations of authentic texts? These old words have not only wisdom, they have a power. Nothing can serve the Cause of Buddhism as much as the publication in handy pamphlets of cheap price the authentic texts of the great philosophy. Interpretation is done by this Buddhist Lodge through its monthly magazine and its meetings; let them give us in their pamphlets the life-giving words of the Sage, who teaches the Path of Enlightenment, which can be distributed among the masses.

The last book on our list is in several respects the most striking, not so much for its contents as for the story of its publication. It is the prize essay won by Princess Poon Diskul of Siam, and translated into English by Phra Rajadham Nides. The King himself writes a preface from which we must extract the following:—

Were the whole world to believe in the theory of Karma, then we should all, I venture to say, be in a state of much greater mental contentment. By referring to the belief in Karma I do not mean to advocate fatalism, but on the contrary hope that man would attempt to keep his action healthy, hoping for a consequent healthy result. The theories of Transmigration and Karma require faith, because they cannot be proved absolutely, and yet they deserve faith much more than the theory of Faith itself.

Human nature is such that when a man meets with some misfortune he usually tries to blame some one for it, his superiors perhaps, or the government, the capitalists, the traditions and so on; and failing everything else he blames the supernatural powers that be, or even God himself. Whatever his justifications may be, such blaming is a cause of dissatisfaction. The man may come to hate the object of his blame. It is a little better with those who really believe in supernatural agencies, because they consider that the misfortune is merely a punishment for some misdeed of their own, although in many instances this would be hard to believe, and some suspicion of injustice on the part of the punisher is hard to avoid.

Now with the theory of Karma, we cannot attribute the reason of our misfortune to anybody else but ourselves. It is often obvious that some fault of deed at once bears fruit. But it has been customary with many of us when we can give no apparent reason for our misfortune to take it as a result of some ill deed from before our present existence, the logical moral of which would be to do good and avoid evil while we live, so that we leave behind no trace of fault which may bear fruit later on. It is

my firm belief that by a real belief in Karma one can attain a no mean degree of mental happiness, because then one would not be trying to blame others for one's misfortune.

Thus from Siam, from Hawaii, from France, from England come the good tidings of a Buddhistic renaissance. When will India, where the Buddha preached, awake to its duty of a careful study of the exoteric and the esoteric Teachings of the Lord?

B. S.

CRITICISM WITHOUT FRUIT*.

Destructive criticisms of our European civilisation are not often published in London, and when such an essay appears it generally surmounts the barrier of "financial considerations" by one of two methods. The first of these is by disguise. In these cases the more drastic criticisms are left to the inference of the readers. Such books as Winwood Reade's *Martyrdom of Man* or even Allen Upward's *The New Word*, are accepted as "business possibilities" because they are destructive by implication rather than by direct attack. And since not one reader in ten has the ability, and not one in a hundred the inclination, to draw the vital inferences, the real nature of the attack passes unnoticed.

The second method is by the offer of an inducement, which in nearly every case takes the form of a name sufficiently well known to ensure the sale of the necessary number of copies. Mr. Wells can criticise us all as openly as he pleases, expose our weaknesses, satirise our methods of government, and he will find no difficulty in getting his books published, because they are always financial possibilities.

And before I examine a recent work that attacks our Western civilisation with a vigour occasionally gaminisque in the violence of its gesture, I wish to point one important conclusion that must be drawn from this opening. It is evident enough even to the casual observer, and a matter of certain knowledge to those concerned with the book-trade, that there is no reluctance on the part of a publisher to print, advertise and distribute a work that would overthrow the British Constitution if the principles advocated were put in practice. This, at first sight, may seem to argue a callous indifference on the publishers' part, to suggest that he might be willing to wreck the Empire if his immediate profit were assured. The truth is that it argues nothing of the kind. The publisher, the critic, the average, rather unintelligent reader, all know perfectly well that the destructive criticism will produce no sort of practical result. A few enthusiasts for the existing order may fiercely abuse the author, a journal here and there refuse to notice it, but the book will not be banned simply because its threat is not dangerous. Free speech is permissible only in those countries where the effect of it is not feared. In Russia before the Revolution, the author of an attack upon the Constitution

* *How About Europe? Some Footnotes on East and West*, By Norman Douglas. (Chatto and Windus, London. 7s. 6d.)

was hanged or sent to Siberia. In Russia to-day the censorship is equally stringent, but the prohibited subjects have been, as it were, reversed. Tsardom and Bolshevism have, indeed, much in common. Both represent the attempt of the threatened and unstable to rule by fear—an impossible task in the long run, since persecution invariably fosters and stimulates reaction.

Yet, if the British nation has not fallen into the far depths of this error, *laissez-faire* and indifferentism are not the most desirable substitutes. And it is, in effect, this aspect which Mr. Norman Douglas so passionately and at times peevishly criticises in his book *How About Europe?*, the work that is responsible for the present article. Mr. Douglas tells us that he came across a book entitled *Mother India*—itself a reply to an earlier work—in which the conditions and customs (notably child-marriage) of India are censured from a Western point of view. And since Mr. Douglas's prejudices are not those of the ordinary British citizen, he was provoked to examine by way of parallel, the conditions and customs of Europe as seen by one who has been able to separate himself from the influences of his early teaching.

His indictment is a severe one and I am not concerned to quarrel with it in this place. He attacks for instance our system of education which he says—and I agree with him—"is a centripetal process.... creates a type instead of a character.... instils uniformity which is an enemy of civilization.... is a governmental contrivance for inculcating nationalism." He attacks our morals, our hypocrisy, even our cooking. But, perhaps, the keenest and most telling of his attacks is directed against the fatuities of modern legislation and the mentality of a people who tamely endure such absurdities as the following:

"Last Tuesday a woman shopkeeper sold a two-penny packet of cigarettes 'because she needed the money' and was fined the cost of the prosecution."

"On Saturday a Paddington confectioner was fined £5 for selling two-pennyworth of cough drops after hours. His defence was that he thought they were medicine."

These are two examples, only, out of many which are punctuated by such comments from Mr. Douglas as "Can cretinism go further?" or "Babies. That is what any Oriental would call us."

So far—and indeed, much further than this—I find myself, despite a pervading sense of uneasiness, unable to counter the charges he brings against Europe at large with England as focus and chief exemplar. But when he draws the deduction that the English taxpayer is a slave under what amounts to a kind of democratic autocracy, I feel the need for insisting upon a distinction. I have said in my opening that the autocratic methods of Russia—and I may here add Italy—cannot succeed in the long run. But their failure is of another type to that which follows the indifferentism that is the determining influence in the passing of such puerile legislation as that instanced in the examples quoted—two instances, only, out of such a long list. And the difference between the two forms of failure is the difference between activity and passivity. *Autocracy is a stimulant and provokes*

its own downfall. Indifferentism is a soporific and fails by gradual decline. As a people we submit, in fact, to the anomalies of the law, to the interference with individual liberty, to the crass stupidities of so-called social reformers, because we do not care enough to rebel.

It would seem, then, that being so nearly in agreement with Mr. Douglas, I should have enjoyed his book, perhaps written to congratulate him on his insight, and proclaimed myself his disciple. I did none of these things. When I first essayed to read *How about Europe?* a few weeks ago, I laid it down when I was half-way through with a feeling of considerable impatience. I could not counter his attacks. I had no wish to counter them. But I was not in sympathy with the author. The reason for this re-action of mine is not far to seek. It can be explained by a brief quotation from page 5 of the work in question in which Mr. Douglas writes: "The reader will find no suggestion of remedies in these pages. I am not the stuff of which reformers are made." His book, in fact, is just one more to be added to the interminable catalogue of works of unconstructive criticism, and is as useless and futile as that other work *Mother India* which instigated his retort.

The truth in this connection is that criticism of this type is merely a matter of statement, and that there is no secular government nor institution in existence that might not be attacked with equal plausibility. If I choose for a moment to forget my sense of proportion, I could write an equally plausible attack on the methods of science, asking, perhaps, how a man should hope to comprehend infinity by the observation of the "laws" of matter, armed only with a measuring rod, a watch, and a set of formulæ based at the last analysis on a primitive arithmetical assumption? Would it not be possible to state and argue a case in this relation which would present the scientist in the light of a blind fool—to those, at least, who had no truer sense of proportion than the author himself?

Criticisms of this nature, in short, criticisms based on the preliminary statement that the critic is not a reformer and has no remedy, are absurdly easy to write for a man endowed with the wit and literary skill of a Norman Douglas. Already in the course of this article I have reflected adversely on two methods of government and could, if I wished, pillory them first and then pelt them with ridicule. But no end is served, so far as the mass of mankind is concerned, by these methods. The average individual is merely bewildered by them, swinging from one alternative to the other and finally demanding which he must choose, as if he were asked to vote for a Parliamentary candidate—a natural simile since the methods are precisely those of party politics.

I write with feeling on this subject because between the ages of twenty-one and forty-five I was peculiarly vulnerable when confronted by such books as *How about Europe?* I recognised the element of truth that they contained, and sought in my own groping, uninspired way to frame, or rather perhaps to find, a remedy. During one period of several years, I was a convinced socialist and might have remained

one if my natural tendency to further enquiry in these matters had not urged me continually to look beyond the means and attempt to relate the social system to the scheme of the universe. And one faint echo of wisdom that came to me in that uneasy period of searching for the material road to world happiness, may find a statement in the belief that a grain of constructive idealism is worth a ton of destructive criticism.

For what, after all, does it profit me that Mr. Douglas should disapprove so fiercely of the government and intellectual debilities of Europe when I can read so plainly between the lines of his diatribe that the world he, personally, would build nearer to his heart's desire could have no more attraction for me than that he wishes to destroy. The function of this kind of criticism is to break down prejudices. Mr. Douglas's chief object is to show the fools what fools they are. In his fine detachment from the peculiar prejudices of those he attacks, he hopes to make his readers see for once with his eyes the hotch-potch of superstitions, sexual repressions, trivial ambitions, outworn conventions, insincerities and uncertain beliefs upon which the legislation of Europe is founded. But even should he succeed in that object, the individual suddenly gifted with new sight will be no happier and will serve no more useful purpose in his capacity of citizen. He may, like him who was cured of blindness by Jesus, "see men as trees walking" but unless he be given a new faith, either his cure will be only temporary or, at the best, he will assume the rôle of destructive critic within the confines of his own social circle.

Now it may seem that I have in this article laid myself open to be chastised with my own whip. I, too, have criticised freely here and there—governments, the weakness of fault-finding, Mr. Norman Douglas's methods—without offering that grain of constructive idealism, I postulated as being of such fine value. But I hope to write next month on some of the visions of a well-ordered world that have been offered us by Mr. H. G. Wells and others in recent years. And when I come to that subject—which is no more than an extension of the one I have treated here—I propose not, indeed, to "suggest a remedy" in Mr. Douglas's sense of the phrase, but to express and explain my belief that all government of this kind with which we are familiar is but an ephemeral and ultimately negligible phenomenon.

J. D. BERESFORD.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE PATH OF OCCULTISM.

On page 448 of THE ARYAN PATH (July), it is said : " The fully committed Occultist cannot change from one path to the other—any more than one can leap from life into death, and rescind his choice. "

Suppose that the earnest Occultist has taken the first step in the wrong direction, thinking that he is right, is there absolutely no hope that he will ever see his mistake ? Must he finally perish ?

When it is said that he becomes a law unto himself, are we to understand that after " the first step " has been taken, a man shuts himself out from the possibility of being influenced in another direction from outside ?

Perhaps my question may be answered in one of the following articles on this subject.

New York.

ANNA GOEDHART.

[The confusion of our correspondent will be removed if the emphasis is put on the qualifying words, " the fully committed ". Also, all her other questions will be completely answered by a study and not merely a perusal of the series, especially the last one appearing in our October number. There are many important problems affecting the lives of the aspirants and the probationers which are solved in a *practical* way in several contributions to our pages. This magazine has food for all, but especially for the Theosophical student who is seeking help in living his life.—EDS.]

WHY AMERICANS HUSTLE ?

The theory which is implicit in Mr. Quigg's article in your September number about the American *hustle* is : Man is mostly a creature of his physical environment. According to him the distinctive characters of human races are a result of their natural surroundings. The truth, however, seems to be different. One race is distinct from another *not* because of its particular country or climate but because of certain innate tendencies which are peculiar to it and to no other. External environment does not appear to make any *essential* difference to it.

The Punjab or Panchnad is a beautiful land of five rivers ; but the early Indians had to keep themselves safe from the devastating floods of these five rivers. There is evidence to show that they, like

the early Americans, used to make weapons of stones and bones. (*Rigveda* 6 ; 75 ; 11). They used to make big leather bags from the skin of wild animals and these were called *Krivi* (*Rigved* 5 ; 44 ; 4). Huge curd-skins called *Driti* and also other utensils of domestic use were made of animal skins. Certainly all this requires activity and its three implications of curiosity, co-operation and interest in power. These, according to Mr. Quigg, were engendered in the earliest Americans as their distinctive qualities by their peculiar environment which demanded from them a very hard struggle. It would seem however, that all these qualities must have been necessarily present in that race for realising the very adventure of reaching out to a new continent, the possibilities of which were all unknown.

Mr. Quigg seems to think that the forests of ancient India were congenial to meditation. There are, however, numerous passages in the *Rigveda* which prove the most distressing character of the environment which confronted the early Indian settlers. The topography of the Punjab in the *Rigveda* period was altogether different from what it became in later times. Mr. Abinas Chandra Das writes in *Rigvedic Culture* (page 19) :—

The reference in the *Rigveda* to the existence of a sea to the immediate East, West and the South of Punjab, and the prevalence of a cold climate is undoubted. Whatever doubts may have existed in the minds of scholars on these points, have been dispelled by our present geological knowledge.

If the geological evidence to which Mr. Das refers be really conclusive there would hardly remain any doubt with regard to the truth of the view that the early Indians must have had at least as difficult circumstances as the early Americans. In that case, Mr. Quigg's view that forests of India might well form "a happy sanctuary for sages" has no support from facts. The theory implied in his treatment that man is mostly a creature of his physical environment does not seem to be based on sound logic. The Americans *hustle* not because of their peculiar surroundings but because it is in their blood-stream to hustle. We Indians meditate not because of our peculiar forests, but because it is our genius to meditate. Mr. Quigg's attempted explanation of the American hustle appears to be only one more instance of what he is trying to explain.

Bombay.

D. G. V.

COLOUR LINE IN AFRICA.

Some first hand acquaintance with the Negro in his own environment, both in West Africa and the northern and southern states of U.S.A., impels me to take up two of the conclusions in Mr. J. D. Beresford's most interesting article on "The Colour Line," a question long an object of my study :—

- (1) Is the Negro so stubborn and so slowly adaptable as to be uninfluenced by climatic and physical influences ?
- (2) Is it a fact that all Negroes are not of the same "world-race" as ourselves ?

First, compare, on the one hand, the marked differences between the leisurely, white, American southerners and the alert, white, American northerners and, on the other hand, what happens to the southern Negro when he migrates north to Harlem. The reactions to climatic and physical influences are not dissimilar whether the individual be white or coloured. Consider the fascinating story of that famous Negro institution, the Tuskegee Institute, Alabama, of its founder Dr. Booker T. Washington, of its present head, Prof. Robert Russa Moton (whose book *What the Negro Thinks* was reviewed, I noted, in the pages of your April issue) and of other Negro scholars and musicians.

Turning to West Africa, who cannot but be interested in noting the abysmal differences between the primitive Africans of the bush and their contemporary Ethiopians on the coastal plain who come to London and walk off with the prizes ahead of their Caucasian brothers of our Inns of Court? Such outstanding men as these Negroes cannot be said to be "slowly adaptable" and "uninfluenced by climatic and physical influences." What is the explanation?

This brings in the second point. Ethnologically, all Negroes are held to be of the same racial stock and not Aryans. According to a perversion of what is my understanding of the true Theosophical teaching, which much interests me, they are all held to belong to the Fourth Root Race as Mr. Beresford appears to imply. To me neither the one explanation (scientific) nor the other (shall I call it pseudo-Theosophical?) explains the marked differences in Negroes which are as distinctive as among Caucasians or any other race, for that matter. The only explanation that fits all the facts and resolves the problem which I have come across in years of study of the colour line is the one made by H. P. Blavatsky showing the distinction between the races to be no ethnological one *i.e.*, there are Fourth Race men in Caucasian bodies and Fifth Race men in Ethiopian bodies—the term "race" in her works being used, it seems to me, in a soul-sense and not a body-sense. In other words, members of the Fourth Root Race are not confined to any one country or colour any more than are members of the Fifth Root Race; and the term "Root Race" must, therefore, be understood in a deeper and more significant sense than Mr. Beresford's "World Race." The views of other students on the subject would interest me.

London.

T. M.

THE WORD OF GOD.

The chief trouble that afflicts the world to-day is the circumstance that Science has invaded the field of Religion. The whole method and scope of science is material. Science deals with the objective; it is not satisfied with any result that it cannot measure, weigh, tabulate. Religion, on the other hand, deals with the subjective world, with things that cannot be gauged by physical instruments. Who can weigh or measure such intangibilities and imponderabilities as thought, aspiration, faith, hope, love, patience.

There should be no real conflict between religion and science, if they exercise their true functions, since they have to do with distinct departments of life, *viz.*, the spiritual and the material. No two things whose aims, purposes, means and methods are entirely distinct and unrelated, can come into conflict, the one with the other. Each one goes its own way, entirely indifferent to and regardless of the other. An eagle does not fight the trees and rocks upon which it alights. There is not enough in common between an eagle and a tree or a rock to give rise to warfare between them.

The reason why a pseudo-conflict between religion and science has arisen in our day is two-fold in nature. First, the clear demarcation between them has not been observed. Second, the enormous power and prestige that science has secured through its scientific inventions (aeroplanes, radio, television, etc.) through its investigations in the fields of chemistry, physics, astronomy, and through the many comforts, conveniences, and material blessings that it has conferred upon mankind, have caused it to wax bold, and to think itself sufficient for all the needs of man, spiritual as well as material. An analogy to this attitude of science is offered by the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages. When this Church had strengthened and organized its ecclesiastical power, then it reached after political power in order that it might rule the whole world, and the whole of man, body and spirit. Science to-day is trying to do the same thing, only instead of beginning with spirit, as the Catholic Church did, it began with matter, and is now reaching after the spirit.

Science has already broken down the first defences of the Church and has broken them down all along the line. Nothing shows this more clearly than the way in which ministers of religion have surrendered to the enemy by pinning their faith to the letter rather than to the spirit of Scripture! In the elucidation of spiritual truths they are employing the same fallible reasoning powers that scientists employ, instead of hearkening to the still small voice of the Spirit. The more enlightened among us are bound to recognise the working within us of some force (which we call "soul") that cannot be identified with the functioning of the brain, as scientists identify it, but which transcends human reason. Indeed a mystic who is caught up into paradise, or to the third heaven, feels his soul mingled with God in an ineffable ecstasy and perfect unity. Such an one is a true Brahmana, of God's caste, not of man's caste.

Since science is trying to gain mastery over the spiritual forces of the world, the question presents itself:—What must the handful of spiritual men, sages and pundits do to stem this swelling tide? I am not exaggerating the situation. Everywhere voices that were once singing and happy, made musical by the accents of faith, hope and love, now speak sombrely in the gloomy tones of sorrow, defeat and despair. What forces of Light, Soul, Divine Truth, and Righteousness must be brought to bear upon the hosts of Darkness, Matter, Atheism and Evil?

There is only one Force that can prevail against the Hosts of Darkness. There is only one Force, no matter under how many names it is known. That Force is the Word. Not without reason is Jesus Christ called the Word, for everything He did—and He did much—He did through His divine utterances. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.”

The Word or Idea (Idea in its idealized sense of divine truth emanating from God and uttered through holy men) was the medium through which all the inspired prophets and sages of antiquity did their work. These great and good men spoke, and the world listened and heeded their teaching. Like Jesus and Gautama, they spent the early years of their lives in acquiring experience of men and manners and then they stood upon their Mounts, or sat under their Bo Trees, or retired to their cloistered cells, and gave God's messages to men. And at the sound of their voices, laden with divine pity and divine love, the desert blossomed like the rose, the crooked souls of men grew straight, and a Light and Glory shone upon all the dark recesses of Earth. What accomplished these great and stupendous miracles? Not the prophets and sages themselves. They would have been the first to deny that any virtue came from themselves. No, they were but flesh and blood men like ourselves. Their power came from the Word of God fructifying in the fertile soil of their souls.

That Word has power to-day as it always had, but unfortunately it is not so clearly uttered by the men of our day.

What the world needs at the present time more than it needs anything else, are men of the Word of God, men who will follow as closely as possible in the footsteps of Jesus, Gautama, and like-minded men, and who will spread the Gospel of the Vision of God over the earth. Not very many such men are needed, only a few here and there in different parts of the world. Indeed, not many such men can be found for they must be truly enlightened ones, strong wise and good—at least in some measure. Such men should spend the first decades of their lives in study and acquiring experience of life.

Such sacrificing Ones with enough of study and experience should mount the rostrum and utter divine messages to men, or retire to their lonely cells (which are not lonely, for God is there), and taking pen in hand send out divine messages throughout the world. “The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them ; and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose.”

Coeur d'Alene,

Idaho, U. S. A.

CHARLES HOOPER.

ENDS AND SAYINGS.

“——ends of verse
And sayings of philosophers.”
HUDIBRAS.

THEOSOPHY AND NEO-THEOSOPHY.

In the July *Quarterly Review* appears an excellent article entitled “The Wisdom of the East,” which is a survey of the series of books published under that general title by John Murray. The article is not signed; but the writer is judicious and discriminative, and almost everything he says has a Theosophic atmosphere. The more reason, then, to notice the following remark about Theosophy in this article.

The Theosophists....are a dwindling body drifting away from the pure Theosophy of the Upanishads and Buddhist. Mysticism towards Catholic ceremonial or vague apocalyptic dreams.

Especially noteworthy is the *raison d'être* for the insertion of this remark. The writer is examining the possibilities of the West being influenced by the wisdom of the East. For this task Theosophists of the last century, under the inspiring guidance of H. P. Blavatsky, were fully competent. No less an Orientalist than M. Emile Burnouf wrote in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* of July 1888 the following concerning the Theosophical Society.

The society is very young, nevertheless it has already its history.... It has neither money nor patrons; it acts solely with its own eventual resources. It contains no wordly element. It flatters no private or public interest. It has set itself a moral ideal of great elevation, it combats vice and egoism. It tends towards the unification of religions, which it considers identical in their philosophical origin; but it recognises the supremacy of truth only....

With these principles, and in the time in which we live, the society could hardly impose on itself more trying conditions of existence. Still it has grown with astonishing rapidity....

From that position of eminence the Society has, alas, declined. Various splits have occurred, and different organizations claim the privilege of being the original society. Whatever any of them may be according to the letter of the law—not to speak of their self-made claims—they have to be judged by the spirit of sacrifice and service evinced in the cause of Brotherhood, of Wisdom and of Spirituality. In short, the public has a right to view any Theosophical body in the light of the above remarks of M. Burnouf.

And now to return again to the charge against Theosophists made by the writer in *The Quarterly Review*. For the generality of people calling themselves Theosophists, especially in Europe, it is well made, deserved and true. But on behalf of the all too few students of *genuine* Theosophy, THE ARYAN PATH must speak. Its very existence is for the purpose of the dissemination of pure Theo-

sophy, to restore in the world its lost prestige and position. Even a glance at *Isis Unveiled* by H. P. Blavatsky will show in what light "Catholic ceremonial" was viewed; still more, the reader will find therein repeated warnings, accompanied by full explanations of every variety of psychical phenomena—warnings given to save the student from falling into the pitfalls of vague fancy, dishonest make-belief and even worse. The basic Catholic tenet of Apostolic Succession, with which the morally debasing and weakening doctrine of forgiveness of sins is intimately connected, was examined and described as "a gross and palpable fraud" (*Isis Unveiled* II, 544), and into this many neo-theosophists have fallen. And they have so fallen because the grave warnings to guard against the development of psychic powers "as it threatens to do in a hot-bed of selfishness and all evil passions" (*Key to Theosophy*) were not heeded; wrong paths were followed, with the result that evil passions came to the fore accompanied by unreliable psychism and fakement, and the blind devotees fell prey to claims based on them.

THE ARYAN PATH labours with the hope of popularising the fact that this clap-trap, this childishness which passes as Theosophy, is but neo-theosophy with which serious-minded students of the ageless and immemorial Wisdom have nought to do. The real Founders of the Theosophical Movement of 1875 were some great Indian Mahatmas, whose accredited Agent, H. P. Blavatsky, expounded once again the teachings of the ancient Wisdom-Religion. At her passing in 1891 she named no "successor," though some have claimed this position for themselves, or allowed others to claim it for them. We repeat, she left no successor, but she *did* leave behind her profound expositions and teachings. These contain keys and clues to the true understanding of the Wisdom of the East. She herself described her two monumental volumes of *The Secret Doctrine* as a nosegay of flowers culled from the gardens of hoary antiquity, she but supplying the string that tied them. These noble soul-satisfying teachings have been left unstudied and their place has been given to grotesque and ludicrous dogmas based on "vague apocalyptic dreams" to which the writer in *The Quarterly Review* refers.

During her lifetime, H. P. Blavatsky published from her own pen a characteristically frank and vigorous article on Pseudo-Theosophy, from which it is opportune and apt to quote this:

If the "false prophets of Theosophy" are to be left untouched, the *true* prophets will be very soon—as they have already been—confused with the false. It is high time to winnow our corn and cast away the chaff. The T.S. is becoming enormous in its numbers, and if the *false* prophets, the pretenders, or even the weak-minded dupes, are left alone, then the Society threatens to become very soon a fanatical body split into three hundred sects—like Protestantism—each hating the other, and all bent in destroying the truth by monstrous exaggerations and idiotic schemes and shams. We do not believe in allowing the presence of *sham* elements in Theosophy, because of the fear, forsooth, that if even "a false element in the faith" is *ridiculed*, the latter "is apt to shake the confidence" in the whole.

THE ARYAN PATH claims neither esoteric nor exoteric lineage, though it tries faithfully to follow in the footsteps of its illustrious predecessors. It has, we repeat, as its chief object the dissemination of the true elements of ancient and ageless Theosophy, for which H. P. Blavatsky laboured. In advancing science, in archæological excavations, in the progress of philosophy, in the growth of psychical research, her views, the propositions laid down in her books, are rapidly gaining ground and recognition. Our's the task—and we need and would welcome more companions in every quarter of the globe—to work for the propagation of Theosophy. Unconcerned with organizations, we recognise in those who labour impersonally and self-sacrificingly for the spread of THE SECRET DOCTRINE the true and only successors and heirs of H. P. Blavatsky.

We need all our strength to meet the difficulties and dangers which surround us. We have external enemies to fight in the shape of materialism, prejudice and obstinacy; the enemies in the shape of custom and religious forms; enemies too numerous to mention, but nearly as thick as the sand-clouds which are raised by the blasting Sirocco of the desert. Do we not need our strength against these foes? There are the worst foes of all—those of a man's own household—Theosophists who are unfaithful both to the Society and to themselves. Thus indeed we are in the midst of foes. Before and around us is the "Valley of Death," and we have to charge upon our enemies—right upon his guns—if we would win the day. Cavalry—men and horses—can be trained to ride almost as one man in an attack upon the terrestrial plane; shall we not fight and win the battle of the Soul struggling in the spirit of the Higher Self to win our divine heritage?

H. P. BLAVATSKY—*Five Messages.*

1900

THE ARYAN PATH

51, Esplanade Road,
BOMBAY.

CONTENTS FOR OCTOBER.

AT THE ROUND TABLE

WHAT THE WEST CAN LEARN IN AND FROM THE EAST—*By Upton Close*

WHAT CAN INDIA CONTRIBUTE—*By N. B. Parulekar*

THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD—*By Max Plowman*

KARMA, THE GREAT EVOLUTIONARY FORCE—*By Gerald Nethercot*

SKANDHAS—*A Note on the Above*

SELF, THE DISCIPLINARIAN—*By B. M.*

THE PURGATION OF SUFFERING—*By John Middleton Murry*

PERSONAL AND IMPERSONAL METHODS—*By J. D. Beresford*

A NOTE ON THE ABOVE

SERMONS IN STONES—*By Kumar Ganganand Sinha*

THE GREAT SELF IN DAILY LIFE—*By W. Stede*

DIMENSIONS IN SPACE AND HUMAN UNDERSTANDING—*By Ivor B. Hart*

A NOTE ON THE ABOVE

THE PATH OF THEOSOPHY

IN THE WORLD OF BOOKS—*By K. R. R. Sastri and others*

CORRESPONDENCE

ENDS & SAYINGS

Per Annum—Rs. 10 India ; £1 Europe ; \$ 5 America.

Single Copy—Re. 1 India ; 2s. 6d. Europe ; 50 cents America.

Aryan Path Office	..	51, Esplanade Road, Bombay.
" " "	..	293, Regent Street, London, W. I.
" " "	..	119, West 57th Street, New York.

Also available at the

UNITED LODGE OF THEOSOPHISTS :

LONDON	293, Regent Street, W.1.
LOS ANGELES	245 West 33rd Street.
NEW YORK	1 West 67th Street.
PARIS	14, rue de l'Abbé de l'Epée.
PHILADELPHIA	1711, Walnut Street.
SAN FRANCISCO	Pacific Building, 4th & Market Streets.
WASHINGTON, D. C.	709, Hill Building, 17th & Eye Streets.

JUST OUT

ECHOES FROM THE ORIENT

A Broad Outline of Theosophical Doctrines

By WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

This little book of fifty-six pages consists of a series of articles contributed in 1890 to an American journal. It is therefore popular in style, while at the same time it is packed with information. Anyone desiring to get a bird's-eye view of the philosophy should possess this book.

Paper Cover.

Price Annas 4, 6d. or its equivalent.

THE VOICE OF THE SILENCE

Being Chosen Fragments

From

“The Book of the Golden Precepts”

By H. P. BLAVATSKY

Cloth Bound.

Price Annas 8, 1s. 6d. or its equivalent.

U. L. T. PAMPHLET SERIES

A long-felt want is being supplied by the publication of old magazine articles by reliable Theosophical writers. These valuable contributions to the study of Theosophy have long been inaccessible to the public, and are now being brought out in pamphlet series at the lowest possible cost to the purchaser:

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| 1. Is Theosophy a Religion | <i>H. P. Blavatsky.</i> |
| 2. What Theosophy Is | <i>H. P. Blavatsky.</i> |
| 3. Universal Applications of the Doctrine, and
the Synthesis of Occult Science | <i>W. Q. Judge.</i> |
| 4. Castes in India | <i>Damodar K. Mavalankar.</i> |
| 5. Theosophy Generally Stated | <i>W. Q. Judge.</i> |
| 6. Karma | <i>W. Q. Judge.</i> |
| 7. Thoughts on Ormuzd and Ahriman.. .. | <i>H. P. Blavatsky.</i> |

Price : Each Anna 1, or 2d. or 5 cents.

THEOSOPHY CO. (INDIA), LTD.,
51, Esplanade Road, BOMBAY.